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# Introduction

This document is for the phase 1 discussion of M-TRP PUSCH and PUCCH enhancement for Rel-17. Previous FL summary version can be found in R1-2108298.

R1-2108298 Summary#1 of Multi-TRP for PUCCH and PUSCH Moderator (Nokia)

Latest proposals are in yellow.

Offline agreements are in purple.

FL update is in blue.

# Multi-TRP PUCCH transmission

The remaining open issues and company views are summarized below. The issues discussed by one or two companies are not listed for now.

## 2.1 Open Proposals

### Issue #2.1: Power control: TPC

**Original Proposal 2.1:** For per-TRP closed-loop power control,

* When the second TPC field is configured and the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (or PUSCH transmission in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2) is associated with one “*closedLoopIndex*” value for single TRP transmission, the other TPC field associated with the other “*closedLoopIndex*” value is unused.
  + Note: Each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively (i.e., 1st /2nd TPC fields correspond to “*closedLoopIndex*” value = 0 and 1, respectively).
* When the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI format 1\_0 (fallback DCI) is associated with two “*closedLoopIndex*” values for multi-TRP PUCCH transmission schemes, the single TPC field (the existing TPC field) is applied to both closed loop indices for the scheduled PUCCH.

Please comment on preferred changes to the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **QC** | Support the proposal.  For the first bullet: We also do not see the need for optimizations in the case of one closedLoopIndex.  For the second bullet: Unlike mTRP PUSCH, mTRP PUCCH only depends on PRI field which exists also in fallback DCI. Hence, the proposal is needed. |
| **LG** | Support the proposal. |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Support the proposal. |
| **MediaTek** | Support. |
| **Apple** | OK with the proposal. We are also open if the TPC indication is decoupled with the scheduled UL channel, i.e. the first TPC is always for the first CL-PC index and the second TPC is for the second CL-PC index. |
| **Ericsson** | Support FL’s proposal. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Support |
| **Spreadtrum** | Support FL’s proposal. |
| **NEC** | Support the proposal. |
| **Fujitsu** | Support the proposal. |
| **Samsung** | Support FL’s proposal. |
| **Vivo** | We think the 1st bullet is not necessary as it is will change UE behavior on PC in our views. The following statement is for PUCCH power control in TS38.213  -  is a sum of TPC command values in a set  of TPC command values with cardinality  that the UE receives between  symbols before PUCCH transmission occasion  and  symbols before PUCCH transmission occasion  on active UL BWP  of carrier  of primary cell  for PUCCH power control adjustment state, where  is the smallest integer for which  symbols before PUCCH transmission occasion  is earlier than  symbols before PUCCH transmission occasion  If both TPC fields are used, the above spec still works without any change regardless whether both closed loop indices are associated with PUCCH or not, meaning that the accumulated TPC command set for a PUCCH transmission occasion with either closed loop index consists of TPC for the closed loop index received during the TPC accumulated window as shown in the following figure. For the STRP PUCCH with closed loop index *l*=0, TPC accumulated TPC command set consists of TPC 1 and TPC 3 which are received during TPC accumulated window 1, while for the STRP PUCCH with closed loop index *l*=1, TPC accumulated TPC command set consists of TPC 2, TPC 4 and TPC 6 which are received during TPC accumulated window 2.    For the second bullet, we are fine. |
| **CMCC** | Support the proposal. |
| **Nokia** | Support the FL’s proposal |
| **CATT** | Support the proposal. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | Support the proposal. |
| **ZTE** | Support in principle.  On the first bullet, note that “Note1” in the previous agreement states that per-TRP closed-loop power control is only applicable when CLIs are not the same for TRPs, but one use case is missing, that is, two beams with two same CLIs for MTRP operation. Besides, regarding the indication of one TPC value by two TRP fields, other solutions may need more discussions and should be listed for further study and down-selection. Hence we suggest to revise this proposal as follows:  Proposal 2.1: For per-TRP closed-loop power control,   * When the second TPC field is configured and the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (or PUSCH transmission in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2) is associated with one “*closedLoopIndex*” value for single TRP transmission or with two same “*closedLoopIndex*” values for multi-TRP repetitions,   + Alt 1: the second TPC field associated with the other “*closedLoopIndex*” value is unused;   + Alt 2: the second TPC field associated with the other “*closedLoopIndex*” value is set as the same value of the first TPC field;   + Alt 3: both the first and second TPC fields are jointly indicate the TPC value;   + Note: Each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively (i.e., 1st /2nd TPC fields correspond to “*closedLoopIndex*” value = 0 and 1, respectively). * When the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI format 1\_0 (fallback DCI) is associated with two “*closedLoopIndex*” values for multi-TRP PUCCH transmission schemes, the single TPC field (the existing TPC field) is applied to both closed loop indices for the scheduled PUCCH.   On the second bullet, we fail to see the motivation to support MTRP PUCCH in fallback DCI. To clear that, one simple way can be that RRC-configured PUCCH resource set for MTRP operation is not available for fallback DCI, which can be up to gNB implementation in reality. |
| **OPPO** | Our first preference is that the 2nd TPC field can be also used, as explained by vivo. Having said that, we can follow majority views for the sake of progress |
| **Fraunhofer IIS/HHI** | Support the proposal |
| **FGI/APT** | We support FL’s proposal. |
| **Xiaomi** | Support the proposal |
| **InterDigital** | Support FL’s proposal. |
| **Intel** | We are thinking similar operation as explained by Vivo is possible. 2nd bullet is okay. |
| **FL update #1** | **Concerns on the first bullet: vivo, ZTE, Intel**  **As there is majority support, RAN1 can close this issue by agreeing to the FL proposal.** |
| **Futurewei** | Support the proposal |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Support the updated proposal. |
| **TCL** | **Support the proposal** |
| **FL Update #2** | **Proposal 2.1:** For per-TRP closed-loop power control,   * When the second TPC field is configured and the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (or PUSCH transmission in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2) is associated with one “*closedLoopIndex*” value for single TRP transmission, the other TPC field associated with the other “*closedLoopIndex*” value is unused.   + Note: Each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively (i.e., 1st /2nd TPC fields correspond to “*closedLoopIndex*” value = 0 and 1, respectively). * When the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI format 1\_0 (fallback DCI) is associated with two “*closedLoopIndex*” values for multi-TRP PUCCH transmission schemes, the single TPC field (the existing TPC field) is applied to both closed loop indices for the scheduled PUCCH.   **Concerns on the first bullet: vivo, ZTE, Intel** |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Support the FL latest proposal. |
| **CATT** | Support the proposal. |
| **Apple** | OK with the latest proposal. If the first bullet if controversial, no further enhancement is also fine, which means each TPC command is for a CL index, regardless of what is scheduled. |
| **ZTE** | We can be fine with this proposal in principle.  However, as we mentioned above, one case can be true and is missing in the first bullet, that is two same “*closedLoopIndex*” values for MTRP operation.  Besides, it is benefit to fixed the unused TPC field to a default value, e.g. “0”, for further enhance the robustness of DCI decoding. That means once the value of the unused TPC field decoded by UE is not “0”, the decoding error occurs.  The following revision is suggested.  **Proposal 2.1:** For per-TRP closed-loop power control,   * When the second TPC field is configured and the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (or PUSCH transmission in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2) is associated with one “*closedLoopIndex*” value for single TRP transmission or with two same “closedLoopIndex” values for multi-TRP repetitions, the value of the other TPC field associated with the other “*closedLoopIndex*” value is fixed to “0”.   + Note: Each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively (i.e., 1st /2nd TPC fields correspond to “*closedLoopIndex*” value = 0 and 1, respectively). * When the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI format 1\_0 (fallback DCI) is associated with two “*closedLoopIndex*” values for multi-TRP PUCCH transmission schemes, the single TPC field (the existing TPC field) is applied to both closed loop indices for the scheduled PUCCH.   @Apple, it is very confusing on your comment “each TPC command is for a CL index, regardless of what is scheduled”. For the case of one CLI with two TPC fields, how does UE understand two TPC command for one CLI? Does it mean TPC value#1 plus TPC value#2, or one of two is ignored? For the case of two same CLIs with two TPC fields, does it mean the two indicated TPC value#1 and TPC value#2 should always be same? We believe this proposal is needed to avoid these ambiguities. |
| **LG** | We are fine with removing first bullet point based on Vivo’s explanation. |
| **MediaTek** | Support the proposal in FL Update #2. We also support ZTE’s revision but with default value “1” which indicates 0 dB for TPC accumulation. |
| **vivo** | If there is no spec change without the FL Update #2 for Proposal 2.1, it would follow our understanding that both TPC fields are used when STRP transmission. In our understanding, there are some cases that the TPC field is still used when no PUSCH is scheduled, such as SPS deactivation, etc. Shall we really add such restriction? |
| **Fujitsu** | Support FL Update#2. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Support |
| **Xiaomi** | Fine with FL’s latest proposal or ZTE’s vision with MTK’s revision. Slightly prefer the FL’s latest proposal. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | Fine with FL’s proposal. |
| **CMCC** | Ok with FL’s latest proposal or ZTE’s version |
| **Nokia/NSB** | Removing first bullet may not give interpretation read by vivo. We fine to removing it as our interpretation align with Apple’s reading. |
| **OPPO** | We fine with FL’s proposal and also fine to remove the first bullet. |
| **Fl Update #3** | **@ZTE, MTek** >> I do not think your update is inline with the earlier agreement. Please see below highlighted texts. When you suggest “with two same “closedLoopIndex” values for multi-TRP repetitions”, how come that is inline with the below agreement.  **Agreement**   * To support per TRP closed-loop power control for PUCCH with DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2, a second TPC field can be configured via RRC. * When the second field is configured by RRC, a second TPC field (similar to the existing TPC field) is added in DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2 (option 3).   + Each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively     - FFS: Whether or not the mapping between the TPC field and the PUCCH transmissions is needed * When the second field is not configured by RRC, a single TPC field (the existing TPC field) is used in DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2, and the TPC value applied for the closed loop index(es) for the scheduled PUCCH * To support per TRP closed-loop power control for PUSCH with DCI formats 0\_1 / 0\_2, adopt the same solution as with M-TRP PUCCH schemes.   + FFS: any additional considerations * Support UE to report the capability on whether it supports the second TPC field * Note1: Per TRP closed-loop power control is only applicable when the “closedLoopIndex” values are not the same for TRPs.   **@vivo, LG** >> removing the first bullet will not result vivo’s interpretation when there are two TPC fields. I would agree with Apple’s interpretation on that. But, in order to make sure you all read this correct, it is better we capture it in the proposal.  **Proposed conclusion 2.1-1:** For per-TRP closed-loop power control,   * When the second TPC field is configured and the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (or PUSCH transmission in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2) is associated with one “*closedLoopIndex*” value for single TRP transmission, the other TPC field associated with the other “*closedLoopIndex*” value is unused.   + Note: Each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively (i.e., 1st /2nd TPC fields correspond to “*closedLoopIndex*” value = 0 and 1, respectively).]   **Offline agreement 2.1-2:** For per-TRP closed-loop power control,   * When the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI format 1\_0 (fallback DCI) is associated with two “*closedLoopIndex*” values for multi-TRP PUCCH transmission schemes, the single TPC field (the existing TPC field) is applied to both closed loop indices for the scheduled PUCCH.   **@All>>** From FL perspective, the first bullet is a conclusion that helps the group to stay in a common understanding. |
| **QC** | Support.  We think the proposed conclusion is needed to align the understanding. |
| **Spreadtrum** | Support |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Support. |
| **ZTE** | @FL, from our understanding on the highlighted part in the previous agreement, especially in the Note 1, it just emphasizes when **two “*closedLoopIndex*” values are different for TRPs**, two TPC fields are used for the two “*closedLoopIndex*”values respectively. Accordingly, it is obvious that one issue is still pending, that is **how to use two TPC fields when the two “*closedLoopIndex*” values are the same for TRPs**. Therefore, we believe that at least the missing case should be added to make specification clear.  Fl comment: Not correct way of interpreting it to my understanding. The enhancement on two TPC fields is for per-TRP power control and each field is for separate closed loop index. And we also say TRPs use different closed loop indexes. The case you mention is not inline. Sorry about that, but we have to move ahead. I am ok to revert if others are also support what you suggest.  **Proposed conclusion 2.1-1:** For per-TRP closed-loop power control,   * When the second TPC field is configured and the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (or PUSCH transmission in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2) is associated with one “*closedLoopIndex*” value for single TRP transmission or with two same “closedLoopIndex” values for multi-TRP repetitions, the other TPC field associated with the other “*closedLoopIndex*” value is unused.   + Note: Each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively (i.e., 1st /2nd TPC fields correspond to “*closedLoopIndex*” value = 0 and 1, respectively).] |
| **Ericsson** | We support FL’s proposed conclusion 2.1-1. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Support |
| **vivo** | I copy Apple’s comment in the following:   * We are also open if the TPC indication is decoupled with the scheduled UL channel, i.e. the first TPC is always for the first CL-PC index and the second TPC is for the second CL-PC index. * If the first bullet if controversial, no further enhancement is also fine, which means each TPC command is for a CL index, regardless of what is scheduled.   My reading on Apple’s comment is that both TPC fields are used for CLI=0 and CLI=1 respectively, regardless STRP or MTRP UL is scheduled if we don’t have the first bullet.  Maybe Apple can explain their understanding?  We also think two “closedLoopIndex” with same value for different TRPs raised by ZTE is a valid case to be considered.  FL: please also check my comment on ZTE. |
| **Fl update #4** | Added a comment for ZTE. Let’s go ahead with the following conclusion.  **Proposed conclusion 2.1-1:** For per-TRP closed-loop power control,   * When the second TPC field is configured and the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (or PUSCH transmission in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2) is associated with one “*closedLoopIndex*” value for single TRP transmission, the other TPC field associated with the other “*closedLoopIndex*” value is unused.   + Note: Each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively (i.e., 1st /2nd TPC fields correspond to “*closedLoopIndex*” value = 0 and 1, respectively). |
| **ZTE** | @FL, please see the attached comment from your side in round 2 in RAN1#105-e, where the key parts are highlighted as this. As your previous assessment, the cases (i) and (ii) can be true and possible for RRC-configured PUCCH resources. More specifically, case (i) is used for STRP operation as in Rel-15/16, case (ii) is used for no per TRP closed loop power control for MTRP operation, which is benefit to gNB scheduling. Based on the previous agreement, it can be seen that only case (iii) can be ensured, because Note 1 emphasizes the premise is “**when two “*closedLoopIndex*” values are different for TRPs”**. As you commented that “The enhancement on two TPC fields is for per-TRP power control and each field is for separate closed loop index. And we also say TRPs use different closed loop indexes. The case you mention is not inline.”, that’s the reason why case (ii) is missing for MTRP operation. Due to the indication way of case (ii) is same as case (i), that is two TPC fields to one TPC value for one CLI or two same CLIs, it is reasonable to make the indication way of case (ii) to be clear as well.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | FL phase1 update1 | * Note 1 text on “This does not have ~~to~~ any relation to the RRC parameter ~~defining the DCI field size~~ indicating the presence of the second TPC field.” >> As explained by ZTE and Oppo in details, RRC configuration on “closedLoopIndex” is configured within the PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo, which creates the following possibilities for the PUCCH resource indicated in DCI,  1. a single beam with a single closed loop index, or 2. two beams with a single closed loop index, or 3. two beams with two different closed loop indices.   As already mentioned in Note 1, Per TRP closed-loop power control is only applicable when the “closedLoopIndex” values are not the same for TRPs. But, as also explained by Oppo, having a separate RRC for the second field seems a much cleaner solution without binding the second field to RRC configuration of “closedLoopIndex”. The current form of Note 1 seems to be ok. | |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Support the proposal conclusion. |
| **CATT** | We support to add “or with two same “closedLoopIndex” values for multi-TRP repetitions” in the proposal. |
| **Fl Update #5** | @ZTE >> it may not be wise to use some older discussions as there was not any agreement that we refer now. Anyways, I do not fully get the comment you have above. Please consider the fact that there are not many others thinking in your direction now. If you wish to provide more clear justification (based on agreement before, and missing details to complete the Rel-17 work), that would be great.  @CATT >> I assume you also support the current version of the conclusion as well.  **Proposed conclusion 2.1-1:** For per-TRP closed-loop power control,   * When the second TPC field is configured and the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (or PUSCH transmission in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2) is associated with one “*closedLoopIndex*” value for single TRP transmission, the other TPC field associated with the other “*closedLoopIndex*” value is unused. * Note: Each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively (i.e., 1st /2nd TPC fields correspond to “*closedLoopIndex*” value = 0 and 1, respectively).   Concerns: vivo, ZTE |
| **ZTE** | @FL, we believe the above three cases mentioned in the older discussions are correct and true so far, hence the indication approach of the missing case (ii) should be clear and specified. Otherwise, the specification of Rel-17 will be incomplete due to this obvious leak. According to our many rounds elaborations, I appreciate to see some companies (even previous opponents) can be aligned with our intention, and I wish FL can notice this change. And as of now, no one seems to have doubts about the added part, we can assume majority is in line with our understanding. If anyone still has any questions about this, please ask directly, and we can continue to explain to reach a consensus on it.  **Proposed conclusion 2.1-1:** For per-TRP closed-loop power control,   * When the second TPC field is configured and the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (or PUSCH transmission in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2) is associated with one “*closedLoopIndex*” value for single TRP transmission or with two same “closedLoopIndex” values for multi-TRP repetitions, the other TPC field associated with the other “*closedLoopIndex*” value is unused.   Note: Each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively (i.e., 1st /2nd TPC fields correspond to “*closedLoopIndex*” value = 0 and 1, respectively).] |
| **Futurewei** | Support the proposed conclusion. |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Support the proposed conclusion. |

Issue #2.2: Default beam for PUSCH

**Original Proposal 2.2:** If the PUCCH resource with the lowest ID is activated with two spatial relation info, the spatial relation info with lower ID, is used as the default beam for PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0.

Please comment on preferred changes to the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **QC** | Support. We are also ok with the restriction. Either way, a clear UE behavior or restriction is needed in our view. |
| **LG** | Do not support. This issue can be addressed by gNB implementation. First of all, gNB can configure up to 128 PUCCH resources. So, gNB can configure one or two spatial relation for the remaining 127 PUCCH resources except for lowest ID PUCCH resource. As a result, there are sufficient scheduling flexibility even if we limit one spatial relation for the lowest ID PUCCH resource. Secondly, gNB anyway needs at least one PUCCH resource with one spatial relation in order to support dynamic switching between MTRP and STRP PUCCH transmission. Therefore, if lowest ID PUCCH resource is limited with one spatial relation, gNB can use it for STRP switching. |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Support. |
| **MediaTek** | Support. We share the same view as QC. |
| **Apple** | Support. We are also open to define the restriction. |
| **Ericsson** | This issue can be handled via gNB configuring the PUCCH resource with the lowest ID with a single spatial relation info. Having said that, we do not have strong concerns if there is majority support for this proposal. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Support |
| **Spreadtrum** | Support. |
| **NEC** | Support the proposal. |
| **Fujitsu** | Share same view as QC. |
| **Samsung** | Support FL’s proposal. Since this issue is already discussed several times, we prefer to make the agreement (or conclusion) for this issue in this meeting. |
| **vivo** | Fine with the proposal. |
| **CMCC** | Support the proposal. |
| **Nokia** | We are fine with the proposal |
| **CATT** | Support the proposal. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | Don’t support. We would rather prefer to restrict that the PUCCH resource with lowest ID is activated with one spatial relation info. |
| **ZTE** | Support FL’s proposal, which can ensure the flexibility on PUCCH resource configuration especially when considering STRP/MTRP dynamic switching. |
| **OPPO** | Support the proposal |
| **Fraunhofer IIS/HHI** | Support the proposal |
| **FGI/APT** | We support FL’s proposal. Even though this issue can be handled by gNB implementation, we prefer to agree with this proposal for the sake of progress. |
| **Xiaomi** | Support the proposal |
| **InterDigital** | Support FL’s proposal. |
| **Intel** | Similar view as Ericsson and LG – we think this is low priority optimisation. |
| **FL update #1** | **Concern**s: LG, HW, Intel. E/// can accept the majority view.  Given this was discussed multiple meetings, FL suggest LG , HW, Intel to help the group to close this discussion (regardless the view of small issue). |
| **Futurewei** | Agree with LG and Huawei HiSilicon. |
| **TCL** | **Support the proposal. We share the same view as QC.** |
| **FL update #2** | **Proposal 2.2:** If the PUCCH resource with the lowest ID is activated with two spatial relation info, the spatial relation info with lower ID, is used as the default beam for PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0.  **Concern**s: **LG, HW, Intel.** |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | **Support FL’s latest proposal.** |
| **CATT** | Support the proposal. |
| **ZTE** | Support. |
| **vivo** | Support |
| **Samsung** | Support FL’s update proposal. |
| **Fujitsu** | Support the proposal. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Support |
| **Xiaomi** | Support |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | We can follow the majority view, although it’s unnecessarily over designed. |
| **CMCC** | Support FL’s update proposal. |
| **OPPO** | Support FL proposal |
| **FL update #3** | @HW >> Thanks for the compromise.  **Proposal 2.2:** If the PUCCH resource with the lowest ID is activated with two spatial relation info, the spatial relation info with lower ID, is used as the default beam for PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0.  **@Intel, LG** >> please indicate your view. Really hope to close this issue now. |
| **Intel** | We think doing nothing (no specification change) works absolutely fine. |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Support. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Support |
| **TCL** | Support |
| **FGI/APT** | Support. |
| **vivo** | Support |
| **FL update #4** | **Proposal 2.2:** If the PUCCH resource with the lowest ID is activated with two spatial relation info, the spatial relation info with lower ID, is used as the default beam for PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0.  LG and Intel to confirm |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Support. |

### Issue #2.3: Scheme 1 – Frequency hopping and beam mapping

**Original Proposal 2.3:** When inter-slot frequency hopping is configured with Scheme 1, support the following,

* If sequential mapping pattern is configured, frequency hopping is performed on slot level (as in Rel-15).
* If cyclical mapping pattern is configured, frequency hopping is performed among the repetitions with the same beam.

Please comment on preferred changes to the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **QC** | Support the proposal.  As explained before, the benefit in the case of cyclical mapping is opportunistic early termination. We are also ok with gNB to configure whether frequency hopping is at slot level or among the repetitions with the same beam for cyclical mapping. |
| **LG** | Support the proposal. It achieves frequency hopping gain and beam hopping gain simultaneously when cyclical mapping pattern is configured. |
| **Lenovo&MotM** | Support the proposal. It can obtain the frequency diversity gain and spatial diversity gain simultaneously when frequency hopping is performed per beam if cyclical mapping pattern is configured. |
| **MediaTek** | Do not support the proposal. As mentioned by QC, the benefit over sequential mapping with inter-slot FH is merely opportunistic, we fail to identify a systematic gain that worth specifying this feature. |
| **Apple** | Support the proposal. |
| **Ericsson** | For inter-slot multi-TRP PUSCH repetition, we think intra-slot FH can be used for both cyclic mapping and sequential mapping. So we don’t see any need for further enhancements.  The proposal in our paper is specific to Scheme 3 and not Scheme 1. |
| **Spreadtrum** | Support the proposal. |
| **NEC** | Fine with the proposal |
| **Fujitsu** | Support the proposal. |
| **Samsung** | Support FL’s proposal. We can obtain the spatial diversity and frequency diversity with frequency hopping among the repetitions with the same beam. |
| **Vivo** | We do not support. Share similar view as MeidaTek.  Firstly, both frequency and beam diversity can still be obtained through the configuration as in the first bullet.  Secondly, we are not convinced without any performance gain provided by the proposal. If it is a kind of opportunistic early termination, we can still find the cases that the configuration in first bullet has earlier termination than the second bullet. |
| **CMCC** | Support the proposal as it can achieve beam diversity and frequency diversity gain simultaneously for cyclical mapping pattern. |
| **Nokia** | Do not support. Agree with Mtek. |
| **CATT** | Support the proposal for NRep >2.  Note that when NRep = 2, cyclical mapping is applied regardless of the configuration of beam mapping pattern. A clarification on whether frequency hopping is applied or not for NRep = 2 is needed.  When NRep = 2, one of the following candidate solutions can be selected:  - Option 1: frequency hopping is performed on slot level.  - Option 2: frequency hopping is not applied, all the scheduled frequency resources are used by each repetition.  - Option 3: frequency hopping is not applied, half of the scheduled frequency resources are used by each repetition. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | Don’t support the proposal, we have similar view with MTK and Vivo. |
| **ZTE** | We agree with MTK/vivo that the benefit of cyclical mapping is unclear. We prefer FH on slot level for both sequential and cyclical mapping, which is in line with Rel-15 design with no spec impact/change. |
| **OPPO** | Not support and sharing similar view as MTK/vivo |
| **FGI/APT** | We support FL’s proposal. It can ensure that we can obtain spatial diversity and frequency diversity gain no matter cyclical beam mapping pattern or sequential beam mapping pattern is configured. |
| **Xiaomi** | Support the proposal that frequency diversity gain would provide benefits for the cyclic mapping case. |
| **InterDigital** | Don’t support. We share similar view as Ericsson. |
| **Intel** | similar view as MTK/Ericsson that no specification change is needed |
| **FL Update #1** | **Concerns: MTek, E///, vivo, Nokia, HW, Oppo, ZTE, Intel**  **Several companies have raised issues. Proponents have explained the use of this multiple times in past few meetings. If group is not converging, we could try GTW discussion (if we get time after some other critical issues).** |
| **Futurewei** | Agree with MediaTek |
| **TCL** | **Support the proposal as it provides both frequency and beam diversity.** |
| **FL Update #2** | Proposal is copied below (no change).  **Proposal 2.3:** When inter-slot frequency hopping is configured with Scheme 1, support the following,   * If sequential mapping pattern is configured, frequency hopping is performed on slot level (as in Rel-15). * If cyclical mapping pattern is configured, frequency hopping is performed among the repetitions with the same beam.   **Concerns: Mtek, E///, vivo, Nokia, HW, Oppo, ZTE, Intel, IDC, FW**  A large number of companies believe this proposal is not needed. Proponents may further clarify. |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Support the FL’s latest proposal. It can obtain both the frequency diversity gain and spatial diversity gain if frequency hopping can be performed per beam/link when cyclical mapping pattern is configured. |
| **CATT** | Support the proposal for NRep >2.  When NRep = 2, whether the frequency hopping scheme follow the configuration of beam mapping pattern or follow the actual beam mapping should be clarified. |
| **Apple** | If this cannot be agreed, we think one way is to use dynamic switching between sequential mapping and cyclic mapping or we can remove cyclic mapping. Otherwise, if this is configured by RRC, most likely cyclic mapping would never be configured. |
| **ZTE** | We still prefer FH always performed on slot level, which can also work and without spec impact/effort. |
| **Vivo** | Can the proponents show the performance comparison between the two bullets to see how much benefit of the second bullet can provide? |
| **Fujitsu** | Support FL Update #2. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Support |
| **Xiaomi** | Support the FL’s proposal, the spec impact is limited but diversity gain can be achieved for cyclical mapping. Apple’s suggestion of dynamic switching could also be discussed. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | We don’t see the benefits of cyclic mapping plus frequency hopping, compared to sequential hopping. Therefore, we prefer FH on slot level. |
| **CMCC** | Support FL’s proposal. |
| **Nokia** | This is a low priority small optimization. If the group converge on a solution, we may not object to it. |
| **OPPO** | Not support as the benefit is not justified |
| **FL Update #3** | @CATT >> we agreed last time that for repetition = 2, this beam mapping configuration does not apply. Always use beams towards two TRPs.  **ZTE, vivo, OPPO, HW** has concerns.  Let’s try this in GTW.  **Proposal 2.3:** When inter-slot frequency hopping is configured with Scheme 1, support the following,   * If sequential mapping pattern is configured, frequency hopping is performed on slot level (as in Rel-15). * If cyclical mapping pattern is configured, frequency hopping is performed among the repetitions with the same beam. |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Support. |
| **FGI/APT** | Support FL’s proposal. We share the similar view as Apple. If this proposal cannot be agreed, cyclical mapping cannot achieve the frequency diversity gain when performing FH. In addition, Apple’s suggestion of dynamic switching between cyclic mapping and sequential mapping should be discussed if only slot level FH is agreed. |
| **vivo** | We still have concerns. If bullet 1 and bullet 2 have similar performance on BLER or early termination, then the bullet 2 would be a redundant design with spec impact. |
| **ZTE** | We still cannot live with it.  The benefit is unclear, FH on slot level as in Rel-15/16 can also work and without any spec effort. |
| **CATT** | According to proposal 2.3, if repetition = 2 is configured, different frequency hopping rules are applied for configuration with sequential mapping pattern and configuration with cyclical mapping pattern, although UE always use beams towards two TRPs, regardless of the configuration on beam mapping pattern. We prefer to specify a beam mapping rule for repetition = 2 that not relevant to the configuration on beam mapping pattern. |
| **FL Update #5** | @CATT>> The proposal 2.3 is not agreed yet to consider further restrictions on that. We can come back your concern later.  @All >> not fully clear how to go ahead here. Please further convince each other. My plan is to try this GTW is there are no alignment between companies. |
| **Futurewei** | We do not support it but we won’t object it if it has majority support. |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Support the proposal that frequency hopping is performed per beam if cyclical mapping pattern is configured, since it can obtain both the frequency diversity gain and spatial diversity gain. |

### Issue #2.4: Grouping of PUCCH resources

**Original Proposal 2.4:** For the grouping of PUCCH resources in Rel-17 multi-TRP PUCCH repetition schemes,

* Support MAC-CE activating two spatial relation info’s (for FR2) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC.
* Support MAC-CE activating two sets of power control parameters (for FR1) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC.
* When the PUCCH resource is indicated with two spatial relation info’s or two sets of power control parameters, the other PUCCH resources in the group also get updated to have the same two spatial relation info’s or two sets of power control parameters.
* When the PUCCH resource is indicated with one spatial relation info or one set of power control parameters, then the other PUCCH resources in the group also get updated to have the same spatial relation info or the same set of power control parameters.
* The signalling details are up to RAN2 to decide.

Please comment on preferred changes to the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **QC** | Support the proposal, which is the simplest way to update two beams for a group of PUCCH resources in our view. Up to 4 groups is supported in Rel. 16, which is sufficient in our view. |
| **LG** | It seems better to make high level decision first, i.e., whether MTRP PUCCH and STRP PUCCH can be mixed in the same group, because following issues are different depending on the decision. If they can be mixed in the same group, this proposal means STRP PUCCH resource is updated to MTRP PUCCH resource if MTRP PUCCH resource in the same group is updated by MAC CE, or vice versa, but the benefits and motivation of this is unclear. |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Do not support the proposal. Reuse the legacy MAC CE of spatial relation information updating for a PUCCH resource group is enough while a PUCCH resource can be included in two different groups which can activate one or two spatial relation information for a PUCCH resource. The specific impact of introducing a new MAC CE is larger than reusing the legacy MAC CE. |
| **MediaTek** | There seems no need to change the number of associated spatial relation info(s) through MAC-CE. Our proposal is not captured in the FL summary and thus copied below:  Two PUCCH resource IDs can be configured for a PUCCH resource associated with two spatial relation info’s / power control parameter sets. Each of the two PUCCH resource IDs is associated with a spatial relation info / power control parameter set and a PUCCH resource group.  Note that the first PUCCH resource ID can be used for operations not involving PUCCH resource group as in R15. Our scheme has the benefit that the existing MAC-CE can be reused and simultaneously update S-TRP PUCCH and one of the two spatial relation info’s of M-TRP PUCCH. If it is not desirable to have a second ID, we may give it a different name. We provide an example in the following figure: If a MAC-CE indicates ID 0 for updating spatial relation info, then all the spatial relation info’s associated with IDs 0, 2, 4 are updated accordingly. |
| **Apple** | Support the proposal |
| **Ericsson** | Support the proposal |
| **NTT Docomo** | Support |
| **Spreadtrum** | Similar view as LG. We should first clarify whether allow STRP PUCCH and MTRP PUCCH in same PUCCH group |
| **Fujitsu** | Support the proposal. |
| **Samsung** | Support FL’s proposal. This method to configure two spatial relation info (or two sets of PC parameters) for one PUCCH group seems simpler rather than other methods. We can update two spatial relation infos (or two sets of PC parameters) simultaneously for all PUCCH resources in a group. |
| **Vivo** | Support the proposal |
| **CMCC** | Not support the proposal.  We have same view as LG. We should discuss the basic framework for grouping of PUCCH resources first. |
| **Nokia** | Support the proposal. |
| **CATT** | Support the proposal. Whether a PUCCH resource is transmitted in S-TRP manner or M-TRP manner is determined by the number of patialrelationInfo/power control parameter sets activated by MAC-CE. Therefore all the PUCCH resources in the same group should be activated with the same number of patialrelationInfo/power control parameter sets. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | We are fine with the proposal. |
| **ZTE** | We have strong concern on this proposal.  It should be noted PUCCH Resource Group in Rel-16 corresponds to one spatial relation of one PUCCH resource in FR2. For MTRP PUCCH in Rel-17, different spatial relations of one PUCCH resource means toward different TRPs. To keep alignment with the approach in Rl-16, it should configure two spatial relations of one PUCCH resource in two groups, instead of in one. To achieve the purpose above and minimize spec change for RAN2, one reserved bit (designated as “R”) in the existing “Enhanced PUCCH Spatial Relation Activation/Deactivation MAC CE” [TS 38.321 ] can indicate which one of multiple PUCCH groups containing the spatial relation of PUCCH resource should be updated. For group based update of PC parameters in FR1, same principle should be ensured. We suggest to revise this proposal as follows:  Proposal 2.4: For the grouping of PUCCH resources in Rel-17 multi-TRP PUCCH repetition schemes,   * Support one PUCCH resource with two spatial relation info’s (for FR2) can be configured in two PUCCH resource groups in a CC, and MAC CE activating all the PUCCH resources within the PUCCH resource group as in Rel-16. * Support one PUCCH resource with two sets of power control parameters (for FR1) can be configured in two PUCCH resource groups in a CC, and MAC CE activating all the PUCCH resources within the PUCCH resource group as in Rel-16.. * The signalling details are up to RAN2 to decide.   + RAN1 identified that one R field in the current “Enhanced PUCCH Spatial Relation Activation/Deactivation MAC CE” can be used for this purpose. |
| **OPPO** | Support the proposal |
| **Xiaomi** | Same view as LGE, better to have a common understanding on the basic framework of the grouping |
| **InterDigital** | Support FL’s proposal. |
| **Intel** | We agree with LGE to agree on the framework first – 1) how many max PUCCH groups 2) whether mTRP and sTRP in same or separate groups 3) is ordering important for the 2 spatial relation info for mTRP PUCCH |
| **FL update #1** | **Concerns:** LG, Lenovo, Mtek, Spreadtrum, CMCC, ZTE, Xiaomi, Intel  **@LG, Spreadtrum, CMCC, Intel**, **Xiaomi** >> As grouping of PUCCH resources coming from legacy, unless we add extra restriction, it seems that activating one or two spatial relation info for different PUCCH resources within the same PUCCH group can be already supported. Adding more groups, etc are not fully needed unless proponents are aligned on such enhancements.  **@Mtek** >> Yes, it seems I missed to copy that. But I considered this when comparing different opinions in submitted contributions. The direction of your proposal was not in line with the majority view.  **@ZTE** >> Use of reserved entries in MAC-CE is not up to RAN1. To my reading, the direction of the FL proposal is not ruling out your proposal in RAN2 discussions. |
| **Futurewei** | Fine with the proposal in general, but suggest to discuss based on LG’s comment first. |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | We support ZTE’s proposal where a PUCCH resource can be included in two different PUCCH resources to support MTRP PUCCH transmission. |
| **TCL** | We share the same view as LGE. We suggest to discuss the basic framework of the grouping first. |
| **FL update #2** | **Proposal 2.4-1:** For the grouping of PUCCH resources in Rel-17 multi-TRP PUCCH repetition schemes,   * Support MAC-CE activating two spatial relation info’s (for FR2) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC. * Support MAC-CE activating two sets of power control parameters (for FR1) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC. * When the PUCCH resource is indicated with two spatial relation info’s or two sets of power control parameters, the other PUCCH resources in the group also get updated to have the same two spatial relation info’s or two sets of power control parameters. * When the PUCCH resource is indicated with one spatial relation info or one set of power control parameters, then the other PUCCH resources in the group also get updated to have the same spatial relation info or the same set of power control parameters. * The signalling details are up to RAN2 to decide.   **Concerns:** **LG, Lenovo, Mtek, Spreadtrum, CMCC, ZTE, Xiaomi, Intel**  **@All>> FL also like to get more inputs for the case which RAN1 fails to agree on the proposal 2.4-1.**  **Question 2.4-2:** ifthere are no enhancements for grouping of PUCCH resources in Rel-17 multi-TRP PUCCH repetition schemes, what would be your interpretation of the legacy behavior for the UE supporting Rel-17 Multi-TRP PUCCH?   * **Alt.1:** Activating one or two spatial relation info for different PUCCH resources within the same PUCCH group is possible.   + MAC-CE activating single spatial relation info’s for a group of PUCCH resources is allowed only when all PUCCH resources within the group has one spatial relation info. * **Alt.2:** Activating one or two spatial relation info for different PUCCH resources within the same PUCCH group is not possible.   + MAC-CE activating single spatial relation info’s for a group of PUCCH resources is allowed only when all PUCCH resources within the group has one spatial relation info. * **Alt.3**: Any other (please indicate) |
| Lenovo/MotM | We do not support Proposal 2.4-1.  And for Question 2.4-2, we support Alt 1 |
| CATT | Support Proposal 2.4-1.  For Question 2.4-2, what does “PUCCH resources has one spatial relation info” mean? SpatialRelationInfo is not configured per PUCCH resource, isn’t it? In our interpretation, whether a PUCCH resource is associated with one or two SpatialRelationInfo should be determined by the MAC-CE that activates SpatialRelationInfo. |
| QC | Support the proposal.  We have similar understanding as CATT. Whether one or two beams are activated should depend on MAC-CE (unless if a new RRC parameter is introduced specifically to say 2 beams will be activate at some point in the future, which is a strange design). |
| Apple | Support the proposal.  For Question 2.4-2, we think it depends on how RAN2 defines the MAC CE format for 2 spatial relation indication. |
| ZTE | In general, we believe PUCCH group based update is very helpful to save MAC CE overhead and should be supported for Rel-17 MTRP PUCCH.  Regrading proposal 2.4-1, there are several issues when activating two spatial relations in one PUCCH group for MTRP PUCCH resource in FR2(same issues in the case of two PC parameter sets in FR1):   * Issue#1: If both STRP and MTRP PUCCH resources are mixed in one group, how to update the one spatial relation for STRP PUCCH resource? And which of two spatial relations for MTRP PUCCH resource should be linked to STRP PUCCH resource? * Issue#2: To address issue#1, one way can be a PUCCH group dedicated to STRP or MTRP PUCCH resources. However, whether the total number of PUCCH groups should be increased for Rel-17? And how many PUCCH groups should be used for STRP/MTRP operation? * Issue#3: On the third bullet (same issue in forth bullet), group based update for all PUCCH resources with two spatial relations should be fixed, this restriction is unreasonable. Otherwise, which one out of two spatial relations should be updated for all MTRP PUCCH resources in one group? * Issue#4: A new MAC CE design is required, which leads to more workload for RAN2.   According to the concerns above, we fail to see the logical to adopt the approach as shown in Proposal 2.4-1.  By comparison, including two spatial relations of a PUCCH resource in two PUCCH groups respectively should be supported. Based on that, the legacy rules of Rel-16 STRP operation can be ensured, no change on the maximum number of PUCCH groups (up to four RRC-configured PUCCH groups in Rel-16), and reform the existing MAC CE can fulfill this enhancement. Hence we suggest to use the following update proposal:  **Proposal 2.4-1:** For the grouping of PUCCH resources in Rel-17 multi-TRP PUCCH repetition schemes,   * Support MAC-CE activating the spatial relation info (for FR2) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC, where the PUCCH resource can be indicated with one or two spatial relation info’s. * Support MAC-CE activating a set of power control parameters (for FR1) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC, where the PUCCH resource can be indicated with one or two sets of power control parameters. * The signalling details are up to RAN2 to decide. |
| LG | We need to first discuss whether MTRP PUCCH and STRP PUCCH can be mixed in the same group. The proposal has different meaning depending on the discussion. |
| MediaTek | We can accept that a PUCCH resource group consists of PUCCH resources either all with one spatial relation info or all with two spatial relation info’s. However, it is problematic to update the number of associated spatial relation info’s of PUCCH resources by MAC-CE. The R17 coverage enhancement WI has the following working assumption:  • Enhance RRC signaling to allow configuration of PUCCH repetition factor per PUCCH resource  For a PUCCH resource with one spatial relation info and PUCCH repetition factor 1, if the MAC-CE increases the number of spatial relation info to 2, how about its PUCCH repetition factor?  ZTE’s latest proposal is similar to ours, but if it cannot address the issue that a PUCCH resource’s spatial relation info can be updated alone as well. Then, UE does not know which one of the two spatial relation info’s should be updated. ZTE’s latest proposal can be fine if additional restriction is introduced to address the issue. |
| Vivo | If Proposal 2.4-1 is not supported, we are also fine with the proposal given by ZTE but with some modifications to make it clear.   * **Alt.3**: One PUCCH resource can be configured in two PUCCH resource groups in a CC, and MAC CE activating different spatial relation info for each PUCCH resource group as in Rel-16. |
| Samsung | Support the proposal  For Question 2.4-2, we prefer slightly Alt 2. |
| NTT Docomo | Support proposal 2.4-1.  Share similar understanding with CATT/QC whether one or two beams are activated depend on MAC-CE |
| Xiaomi | Better to clarify whether STRP PUSCCH and mTRP PUCCH can be within the same group. Our current understanding for Question 2.4-2 is Alt.1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CMCC | We think it’s better to discuss whether STRP PUCCH and MTRP PUCCH can be mixed within one group and whether the number of spatial relation info of one PUCCH resource can be updated by MAC CE.  For Question 2.4-2, we prefer Alt 1. |
| Nokia | Support the proposal.  For the question 2.4-2: In the existing spec or agreements, there is no limitation (until RAN2 or RAN1 define otherwise) on PUCCH resources in the same PUCCH resource group to be associated with one or two spatial relation info’s (i.e. some PUCCH resources are associated with one spatial relation info and the other PUCCH resources are associated with two spatial relation info). If RAN1 not agreeing to Proposal 2.4.-1, we think that RAN1 does not have to discuss any default operation. RAN2 can discuss it. |
| OPPO | Support Proposal 2.4-1.  For question 2.4-2, we share similar view as Nokia |
| Fl Update #3 | **@CATT, QC, DCM >>** The interpretation I was trying to get the inputs was the following. Anyways, we do not have to discuss these alternatives further as lot of these may depend on how RAN2 going to design this m-TRP MAC-CEs.   * **Alt.1:** Activating one or two spatial relation info for different PUCCH resources (via 6.1.3.18 in 38.321 and new MAC-CE for two spatial relation info’s, respectively) within the same PUCCH group is possible.   + MAC-CE activating single spatial relation info’s for a group of PUCCH resources (via 6.1.3.25 in 38.321) is allowed only when all PUCCH resources within the group has one spatial relation info. * **Alt.2:** Activating one or two spatial relation info for different PUCCH resources (via 6.1.3.18 in 38.321 and new MAC-CE for two spatial relation info’s, respectively) within the same PUCCH group is not possible.   + MAC-CE activating single spatial relation info’s for a group of PUCCH resources (via 6.1.3.25 in 38.321) is allowed only when all PUCCH resources within the group has one spatial relation info.   **@ZTE>>** Some comments to the issues you highlighted on Proposal 2.4-1.   * **#Issue 1>>** Proposal has the following, “*when the PUCCH resource is indicated with one spatial relation info or one set of power control parameters, then the other PUCCH resources in the group also get updated to have the same spatial relation info or the same set of power control parameters*.”. I hope that solves your concern. * **#Issue#2:** Not always. FL thinks that the increase of number of PUCCH groups can be left to RAN2 to decide. * **#Issue 3:** I tried to list your alternative. Please check. * **#Issue 4:** In many earlier instances, RAN2 selected new MAC CEs as that is much easier than debating to reuse of MAC-CEs.Anyways, we should not do their work on using reserve entries. They may have other plans for those bits.   **@LG, CMCC >>** there are nothing called dedicated s-TRP or m-TRP PUCCH resources to my reading. Every PUCCH resource with single spatial relation info can be updated via MAC-CE to have two spatial relation info.  **@MTek** >> on PUCCH repetition number associating to the PUCCH resource, I really do not see an issue with PUCCH grouping. Within a PUCCH group, there can be different repetition numbers as it allows gNB to select different number of repetitions as required. Another way is to increase the number of PUCCH groups. But that could be further discussed after we agree on this framework. Please also see the reply for ZTE on your other comment.  **@Vivo** >> Alt.3 shall be a legacy operation without any new agreement. ZTE proposal is not possible with Rel-15/16.  **Response on Question 2.4-2**  **Alt.1**: **Lenovo, Xiaomi, CMCC**  **Alt.2:** **SS**  **Alt.3:** When the UE support multi-TRP PUCCH repetition, RAN2 to discuss the changes (if any) required in legacy behavior on grouping of PUCCH resources and activating single spatial relation info for group of PUCCH resources – **Apple, Nokia, OPPO, QC, CATT**    For further discussion, let’s use the following alternatives.  **Update Proposal 2.4-1:** For the grouping of PUCCH resources in Rel-17 multi-TRP PUCCH repetition schemes, select one option.  **Option 1**   * Support MAC-CE activating two spatial relation info’s (for FR2) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC. * Support MAC-CE activating two sets of power control parameters (for FR1) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC. * When the PUCCH resource is indicated with two spatial relation info’s or two sets of power control parameters, the other PUCCH resources in the group also get updated to have the same two spatial relation info’s or two sets of power control parameters. * When the PUCCH resource is indicated with one spatial relation info or one set of power control parameters, then the other PUCCH resources in the group also get updated to have the same spatial relation info or the same set of power control parameters. * The signalling details are up to RAN2 to decide.   **Option 2**   * No enhancements on MAC-CE activating two spatial relation info’s (for FR2) or two sets of power control parameters (for FR1) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC. * When the UE support multi-TRP PUCCH repetition, RAN2 to discuss the changes (if any) required in legacy behavior on grouping of PUCCH resources and activating single spatial relation info for group of PUCCH resources   **Option 3**   * Support MAC-CE activating the spatial relation info (for FR2) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC, where the PUCCH resource can be indicated with one or two spatial relation info’s. * Support MAC-CE activating a set of power control parameters (for FR1) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC, where the PUCCH resource can be indicated with one or two sets of power control parameters. * The signalling details are up to RAN2 to decide.   Concerns on Option 1: LG, Lenovo, Mtek, Spreadtrum, CMCC, ZTE, Xiaomi, Intel  Please further indicate your concerns/support on different options, FL suggestion is to go ahead with Option 1 (original proposal). |
| Intel | We have the following questions   * a group of PUCCH resources can be associated with 1 spatial relation info at time t1, then 2 spatial relation info pair at time t2 and then again 1 spatial relation info in time t3 – is this common understanding and this is left to RAN2 for implementation – right ?   **FL: this is the Option 1. Signaling is up to RAN2**.   * when a PUCCH group is associated with 2 spatial relation info – there is an ordering of the spatial relation info pair needed such that the first spatial relation info (and the first closedLoopIndex) can be determined – how is this ordering achieved ?   **FL: As signaling is up to RAN2 in option 1, we can let the details handled there on ordering. To my reading, we still do not have any consensus on supporting Option 1.** |
| QC | Support Option 1.  Just to make sure that we understand Option 2 and 3 accurately:   * Does option 2 mean that this feature (updating 2 beams for a group of PUCCH resources) is explicitly not supported?   **FL: Yes, option 2 means updating two beams for a group is not supported.**   * Does option 3 mean that different PUCCH resources in the group can be activated with different number of beams? The motivation for this is very unclear to us.   **FL: Please check Lenovo Update. To my reading, ZTE suggestion is single PUCCH resource to be in two groups. The resources in one group will get only one beam update at a time. If the resource belongs to two groups, two MAC-CEs are needed to update both beams for that resource. It seems trying to use reserve entry in existing MAC-CE** (**6.1.3.25 in 38.321) .** |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with FL’s explanations. Support Option-1. |
| Lenovo/MotM | In our understanding, Option 3 is very similar with Option 1. We support the update Option 3 as follows:  **Option 3**   * Support MAC-CE activating the spatial relation info (for FR2) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC, where the PUCCH resource can be indicated with one or two spatial relation info’s by the way that it is included in one or two PUCCH resource groups. * Support MAC-CE activating a set of power control parameters (for FR1) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC, where the PUCCH resource can be indicated with one or two sets of power control parameters by the way that it is included in one or two PUCCH resource groups. * The signalling details are up to RAN2 to decide.   In this case, we will support Option 3. |
| ZTE | We support Option 3, we can also be fine with Lenovo’s added part.   * For option 1, how to group based beam update for both STRP and MTRP PUCCH resources simultaneously in one group is unclear and complex. * For option 2, it makes no sense to deny PUCCH group based beam update for Rel-17 MTRP PUCCH, which is very useful to save MAC CE and simplified beam update indication.   Besides, we can also live with Nokia’s suggestion that let RAN2 handle it, but RAN1’s intention should be clarified and included in the LS.  @FL, regarding your reply to issue#1, I fail to see the issue on spatial relation’s association between STRP PUCCH resource and MTRP PUCCH resource can be addressed by the 3nd and 4th bullets in original proposal. Does it mean two kinds of PUCCH resources mixed in one group but update its spatial relation separately? If so, it deviated from the rule on group based PUCCH spatial relation update in Rel-16, where one PUCCH group corresponding to one beam and towards one TRP.  **FL: With option 1, any kind of PUCCH resource (single or two beams) can be in a single group. When two beam activation for a group is received, all resources in a group updated with two beams. Hope that is celar. Similar procedure applied when receiving a single beam for the group. I do not really see a problem you try to highlight here.**  @QC, regarding your question on option 3, actually, it is one PUCCH resource with two beams can be configured in two PUCCH groups, which can be updated based on PUCCH resource grouping for two TRPs. |
| MediaTek | **@FL >>** Let us provide more details on our concern of Option 1. Consider a PUCCH resource with one spatial relation info and repetition factor 1, i.e., single repetition. If we follow Option 1, then the PUCCH resource gets updated to have the two spatial relation info’s **but still with repetition factor 1**. We are not aware of any agreement supporting single repetition for the agreed PUCCH repetition schemes. The agreed minimum number of repetition is two, to our best understanding. We can have the following solutions to address the issue:  1) A PUCCH resource group can be activated with two spatial relation info’s only if all PUCCH resources have repetition factor larger than or equal to two.  2) Repetition factor 1 is supported for all PUCCH repetition schemes.  We do not prefer any of the above solutions, but we can live with one of them if it is majority view.  **FL: At this moment, coverage enhancement is handling this issue of repetition factor. Even for legacy PUCCH grouping, it seems what you mentioned may be valid. We do not have to solve that as priority issue in m-TRP discussions. I suggest raising this in Co. enhancement. I would suggest the following note, “*the impacts on PUCCH resource grouping when PUCCH resources are associated with repetition factor is addressed in m-TRP discussions*”**  We currently prefer Option 3. To align understandings on Option 3, we provide the details of our understanding:   * The number of associated spatial relation info’s for a PUCCH resource is RRC configured. No MAC-CE updating is supported. * For a PUCCH resource with two spatial relation info’s, it is supported that MAC-CE on single PUCCH updates one or two spatial relation info’s. * A PUCCH resource group is only associated with one spatial relation info. A PUCCH resource with two spatial relation info’s can have each of its spatial relation info’s associated with a distinct PUCCH resource group. FFS: how to make association.   **FL: please check the latest update from Lenovo capture your option. I do not suggest it as FL proposal as it is not the majority view. I would suggest you align with Option 1.** |
| Ericsson | In our understanding, being able to update the spatial relation info’s of a group of PUCCH resources via a single MAC CE is beneficial. For instance, the group of PUCCH resources may belong to different CCs in a band, and hence updating the spatial relations of the group of PUCCH resources with a single MAC CE may reduce control signaling. We think we should be able to associate a group of PUCCH resources with either 1 spatial relation or 2 spatial relations at different times via MAC CE.  Hence, we support Option 1. |
| vivo | We are fine with either Option 1 or Option 3 revised by Lenovo/MotM |
| Fl Update #4 | Added some comments under different company comments. Please check.  Concerns on Option 1: LG, Lenovo, Mtek, CMCC, ZTE, Xiaomi  I suggest the concerning companies to accept Option 1. |
| ZTE | @FL, as I mentioned before, one PUCCH group corresponding to one beam and towards one gNB/TRP in Rel-16. For Option 1, let me explain its issue with an example: when PUCCH#0 with one beam and towards one out of TRP#0 and TRP#1, PUCCH#1 with two beams and toward TRP#0 and TRP#1 (or toward TRP#1 and TRP#0), if PUCCH#0 and PUCCH#1 included in one PUCCH group, how to indicate which of two TRPs for PUCCH#0 with one beam should be updated by the PUCCH group?  If RAN1 cannot reach a consensus on the understanding of PUCCH group, we can be fine to send one LS to RAN2 or let RAN2 to complete it. If so, at least RAN1’s intention should be clarified and included in the LS. |
| QC | We do not support Option3 as clarified above since it requires RRC configuration for number of beams, which is not necessary and increases latency (if one of the two beams gets weak, those PUCCH resources cannot be used unless they are reconfigured by RRC to change the number of beams) |
| Lenovo/MotM | We still support Option 3 revised as before considering the flexibility and the specific impact. |
| Ericsson | In our understanding of Option 1, all the PUCCH resources in one PUCCH group should be configured with either 1 spatial relation/set of power control parameters or 2 spatial relations/sets of power control parameters. Then, the MAC CE can dynamically update the 1 or 2 spatial relations/sets of power control parameters.  Do other companies have the same understanding? |
| CATT | Support option 1. We don’t have any agreement on configuring spatialRelationInfo/power control parameter sets per PUCCH resource. SpatialRelationInfo and power control parameter sets are configured in *PUCCH-Config*/ *PUCCH-ConfigCommon.* |
| Fl Update #5 | @E/// : With option 1, there is no limitation/restriction on having certain PUCCH resources with 1 spatial relation info and other with 2 spatial relation info’s in the same PUCCH group.  @ZTE: “*when PUCCH#0 with one beam and towards one out of TRP#0 and TRP#1, PUCCH#1 with two beams and toward TRP#0 and TRP#1 (or toward TRP#1 and TRP#0), if PUCCH#0 and PUCCH#1 included in one PUCCH group, how to indicate which of two TRPs for PUCCH#0 with one beam should be updated by the PUCCH group?”* Single spatial relation info update for PUCCH #0 can be used via MAC-CE (6.1.3.18 in 38.321), and beam can be still towards TRP#0 or TRP#1 if required. I really do not see there is any shortage of signaling possibilities coming from legacy. To many companies reading, most important enhancement on PUCCH grouping for m-TRP is allowing update of two spatial relation info’s for a group of PUCCH resource which is not there in legacy framework. |
| Xiaomi | We agree with QC that RRC configuration should be avoided which would change the mechanism of current spatial relation info triggering via MAC-CE. Thus we prefer option.1. |
| Futurewei | Support the proposal and prefer Option 1. Option 1 is more aligned/compatible with legacy design. It seems even the entire proposal can be up to RAN2 to decide. |
| Lenovo/MotM | As FL mentioned that one spatial relation information can be activated for one PUCCH resource and two spatial relation information can be activated for another PUCCH resource in a same PUCCH resource group in Option 1, then we can support Option 1 since it is more compatible with legacy design. |
| Ericsson | Given FL’s clarrifications in Update #5, we support Option 1 only. |

### Issue #2.5: Support Scheme 2

**Original Proposal 2.5:** Support intra-PUCCH resource beam-hopping (Scheme 2):

* Reuse frequency hopping mechanisms for number of symbols in the first / second beam-hops, and number of DMRS symbols and locations.
* The configured value of *secondHopPRB* can be the same as or different than *startingPRB*.

Please comment on preferred changes to the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Not support. |
| **QC** | **Support the proposal.**  **In the previous meeting, some companies asked for evaluation results and comparing Scheme 2 versus Scheme 3. We have provided detailed evaluations illustrating that PUCCH schemes 2 and 3 have the same performance under both cases of with or without blockage for both RM and polar codes. Only when the UCI payload size becomes large (code rate becomes large) with Polar code and with blockage, PUCCH Scheme 3 is slightly better (1dB) than PUCCH Scheme 2. Critical UCIs (HARQ-Ack) do not have very large payload size.**  **Also, Scheme 2 has multiple important advantages over scheme 3:**   * **With PUCCH repetition (Scheme 1 or 3), UCI multiplexing is not possible, which includes the case of multiplexing different UCIs or multiplexing UCI with PUSCH. However, UCI multiplexing rules for Scheme 2 are much more flexible and those restrictive dropping rules are not needed (similar to existing PUCCH frequency hopping).** * **PUCCH scheme 2 has lower latency as the beam hopping is performed within a given PUCCH resource without the need to conform to sub-slot configurations while in PUCCH scheme 3, different repetitions should be in different sub-slots.** * **With scheme 2, other PUCCH resources (that do not need mTRP or sub-slot based transmission) can be configured flexibly. With Scheme 3, they have to remain within the sub-slot boundary as in Rel. 16.** * **The specification impact of Scheme 2 is very small. In our understanding, the proposal above would be enough for the functionality of Scheme 2.** |
| **Apple** | **Do not support the proposal. It seems to be redundant since we have agreed intra-slot repetition, and there is not enough time for us to consider a new transmission scheme.** |
| **ZTE** | **Support FL’s proposal.** |
| **LG** | **Support the proposal.** |
| **Vivo** | **Support** |
| **Samsung** | **Not support. We can share the same view as Apple.** |
| **Fujitsu** | **Support the proposal. The advantages mentioned by QC are valid.** |
| **Xiaomi** | **Support the FL’s proposal.** |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Support FL’s proposal.** |
| **Nokia** | **This is a redundant scheme to our reading. Do not support.** |
| FL update #1 | Four companies have objections. We could try GTW if we get some time after other critical items. |
| **QC** | **Is scheme 2 redundant? No. We explained the benefits of Scheme 2 above. Maybe companies need to explain why they think it is a redundant scheme. I did not see any company questioning the benefits mentioned above.**  **Is there enough time to consider Scheme 2? Yes. The proposal above takes care of the main functionality of Scheme 2. Maybe companies need to explain why there is not enough time.** |
| **ZTE** | **We agree with QC’s assessment of the current situation and also glad to hear opponent’ response.** |
| **Ericsson** | One challenge on the TRP side with scheme 2 is that the two TRPs have to coordinate within a slot (as PUCCH symbols corresponding to a single PUCCH is split across the two TRPs. This type of coordination is very challenging and hence, we think Scheme 2 can be deprioritized in this release. |
| **vivo** | Support Scheme 2. The gain is obvious when the PUCCH is transmitted only once which has less resource requirement. Regarding the requirement on TRP coordination, it is up to the network capability to configure Scheme 2 or not. |
| **FL update #4** | From Fl perspective, we seem to be closing several issues already during the first week. So, if we get enough time in this meeting, indeed supporting another scheme is not impossible. Suggest more companies to provide details to help the discussion. |
| **QC** | @ Ericsson: In Rel. 16, for PDSCH, we have SDM and FDMSchemeA which are joint encoding / rate matching. Scheme 2 for PUCCH is similar. In fact, this is another reason to have scheme 2 to allow for multiple levels of TRP coordination. The feature can be enabled/disabled depending on the TRP coordination and use case (similar to Rel. 16 MTP discussions). |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Do not support. The total UCI can be received when two hops successfully are received since the UCIs are divided into two parts and there are transmitted to different TRPs. If one hop is lost due to the blockage between the UE and one TRP of TRPs, the whole UCI can’t be received. Besides, the multiplexing of PUCCH may be complicated if PUCCH Scheme 2 is supported. |
| **vivo** | @Lenovo: the decoding can be successful if the code rate is low enough even one hop is completely lost. Besides, Scheme 2 also provide spatial diversity gain. Both QC and us provides the gain of Scheme 2. |
| **Xiaomi** | We support scheme2. Besides the reasons mentioned by QC and vivo, it’s that scheme 2 can be specified for UEs not implementing sub-slot operations, since Scheme 3 support only sub-slot PUCCH. |
| **Futurewei** | Support the proposal |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | We can accept it if majority supports. |
| **Ericsson** | @Qualcomm: Note that implementation complexities of Rel-16 SDM/FDMSchemeA and MTRP PUCCH scheme 2 are very different things. In the uplink case, it is more challenging because MTRP PUCCH Scheme 2 requires symbol level coordination between TRPs which is very challenging. Such symbol level coordination becomes even more challenging with higher numerologies. Note that we don’t have joint encoding/rate matching support for MTRP PUSCH in Rel-17 because of similar issues. So, we are skeptical whether this scheme is practically deployable from network implementation point of view.  Also, given the already high workload in Rel-17, we have concern with adding yet another scheme/option in Rel-17. Note that we should prioritize finalizing the details of the already agreed schemes/options which is much higher priority at this time. So, we do not support Scheme 2. |
| **QC** | @ Ericsson: Can you please explain how Rel. 16 SDM/FDMSchemeA does not require symbol-level coordination but PUCCH Scheme 2 does? I do not follow this part. One is about encoding, and the other is about decoding. In both cases in the absence of this coordination, latency will occur: For DL, latency is a result of having to make scheduling decision earlier. For UL, latency is a result of decoding later. In both cases, with backhaul close to ideal (Rel. 16 assumption), there is no additional latency.  In addition, mTRP PUCCH in Rel. 17 is not only about non co-located TRPs, it equally applies to multiple panels at the receiver side.  As mentioned, Scheme 2 does not have many specification impacts. It is much simpler than Scheme 3 with more benefits. Please also see the FL’s comment above wrt remaining time. We see that most of the issues are already decided and close to be complete. What is more important in our view is the technical benefits of Scheme 2 we mentioned above. |

# Multi-TRP PUSCH transmission

## Open Proposals

Issue #3.2: Default PC parameters

**Original Proposal 3.2:** For single-DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition schemes, when one SRS resource per SRS resource set is configured (i.e., when two SRI fields are absent in DCI formats 0\_1 / 0\_2), per TRP default P0, alpha, PL-RS, and closed loop index is defined by,

* Alt.1
  + The first P0/alpha, PL-RS, and closed loop index are determined by *sri-PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id*, *sri-P0-PUSCH-AlphaSetId*, and *sri-PUSCH-ClosedLoopIndex* mapped to the first *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* associated with the first SRS resource set.
  + The second P0/alpha, PL-RS, and closed loop index are determined by *sri-PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id*, *sri-P0-PUSCH-AlphaSetId*, and *sri-PUSCH-ClosedLoopIndex* mapped to the first *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* associated with the second SRS resource set.
  + Note: How to design the signaling link *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl with*two SRS resource sets is up to RAN2.
* Alt.3
  + If the UE is provided*enablePL-RS-UpdateForPUSCH-SRS*, the first set of values {the first value in *P0-AlphaSet*, the PL-RS corresponding to the first *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* associated with the first SRS resource set and closed-loop index *l* = 0} is used for TRP1, and the second set of values {the second value in *P0-AlphaSet*, the PL-RS corresponding to the first *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* associated with the second SRS resource set and closed-loop index *l* = 1 if  *twoPUSCH-PC-AdjustmentStates* is configured, *l*=0 otherwise} is used for TRP2.
  + Otherwise, the first set of values {the first value in *P0-AlphaSet*, the PL-RS with *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id=0* and closed-loop index *l* = 0} can be used for TRP1, and the second set of values {the second value in P0-AlphaSet, the PL-RS with *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id*= 1 and closed-loop index *l* = 1 if  *twoPUSCH-PC-AdjustmentStates* is configured, *l*=0 otherwise } can be used for TRP2.
  + Note: How to design the signaling link sri-PUSCH-PowerControl with two SRS resource sets is up to RAN2.

Please comment on preferred alternative to down select.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **QC** | Support Alt1. In our understanding, Alt1 is both the simplest and most flexible way (up to gNB how to configure). Alt2/3 force to use two closed loops while the gNB may prefer to not use both closed loops for this purpose (i.e., may want to use the two closed loops for eMBB versus URLLC, or for initial transmission versus retransmission, etc.). In Alt1, this is completely up to the gNB. In addition, Alt1 is a unified way for all ULPC parameters, and we do not think RRC configuration overhead should be concern for mTRP (anyway, RRC configuration is needed for enabling mTRP PUSCH).  It would be good to clarify the benefit of Alt3 given that it is both more complicated and less flexible. |
| **LG** | Support Alt 3, which is a straightforward extension of legacy behavior. |
| **Lenovo&MotM** | Same view with LG, so support Alt 3. |
| **MediaTek** | We support Alt. 1 for its simplicity. |
| **Apple** | Support Alt2. We find there are still a few companies supporting Alt2, we should list Alt2. |
| **Ericsson** | Prefer Alt.1.  In Alt.1, the power control parameters associated with each TRP are indicated in the respective SRI to PUSCH power control mapping. This is consistent with the case when SRI field is present in DCI. We don’t understand why it should be conditioned on enablePL-RS-UpdateForPUSCH-SRS as in Alt.3. Also, generally we prefer not to hard code parameters. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Our 1st preference is Alt.2. And second preference can be Alt 3. For alt.1, it does not support the case where SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl is not provided. Because in legacy behavior, default power control parameters are also determined for this case. We would like to understand with alt.1, does it mean we need to further discuss default power control parameters for the case where SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl is not provided, or it means the case where SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl is not provided is not expected for M-TRP PUSCH. |
| **Fujitsu** | Slightly prefer Alt3. |
| **Samsung** | We are fine with Alt 3. |
| **Vivo** | Support Alt 3. Similar view as LG. Alt.1 changes legacy configuration in terms of always configuring sri-PUSCH-PowerControl even when SRI field(s) is absent.  @QC: we can’t see the complexity of Alt 3 as it is a straightforward way. As legacy STRP systems don’t support the flexibility to use two closed loops when SRI field is absent, we can’t see any problem to associate each TRP with a dedicate closed loop index in Alt 3. |
| **CMCC** | Support Alt 3.  We have the same view with LG and Docomo, Alt 3 is an extension of legacy behavior and Alt 1 doesn’t support the case when the *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* is not provided. |
| **Nokia** | We are open to further discuss the case where SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl is not provided – raised by DOCOMO. |
| **CATT** | Support Alt 3. Alt 1 is a solution assumes that *sri-PUSCH-ClosedLoopIndex* is always configured for M-TRP scenarios. Whether *sri-PUSCH-ClosedLoopIndex* is configured should be up to gNB’s implementation. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | Prefer Alt 1 for simplicity. |
| **ZTE** | Support Alt. 3.  First of all, we think legacy rules on default PC parameters in Rel-15/16 should be taken into account, which are listed below according to the current [TS 38.213]:   * Default P0/Alpha  |  | | --- | | If the PUSCH transmission except for the PUSCH retransmission corresponding to a RAR UL grant is scheduled by a DCI format that does not include an SRI field, or if SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl is not provided to the UE, ..., the UE determines  from the value of the first *P0-PUSCH-AlphaSet* in *p0-AlphaSets.*  *...*  If the PUSCH transmission except for the PUSCH retransmission corresponding to a RAR UL grant is scheduled by a DCI format that does not include an SRI field, or if *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl* is not provided to the UE, , and the UE determines  from the value of the first *P0-PUSCH-AlphaSet* in *p0-AlphaSets.* |  * Default PL-RS Id  |  | | --- | | If  - the PUSCH transmission is scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 and the UE is not provided a spatial setting for a PUCCH transmission, or  - the PUSCH transmission is scheduled by DCI format 0\_1 or DCI format 0\_2 that does not include an SRI field, or  - *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl* is not provided to the UE,  the UE determines a RS resource index with a respective *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id* value being equal to zero where the RS resource is either on serving cell or, if provided, on a serving cell indicated by a value of *pathlossReferenceLinking*  ...  - If the UE is provided *enablePL-RS-UpdateForPUSCH-SRS*, a mapping between *sri-PUSCH-PowerControlId* and *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id* values can be updated by a MAC CE as described in [11, TS38.321]  - For a PUSCH transmission scheduled by a DCI format that does not include an SRI field, or for a PUSCH transmission configured by *ConfiguredGrantConfig* and activated, as described in Clause 10.2, by a DCI format that does not include an SRI field, a RS resource index  is determined from the *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id* mapped to *sri-PUSCH-PowerControlId* = 0 |  * Default closed loop index  |  | | --- | | - *l* ∈{0, 1}if the UE is configured with *twoPUSCH-PC-AdjustmentStates* and *l* = 0 if the UE is not configured with *twoPUSCH-PC-AdjustmentStates* or if the PUSCH transmission is scheduled by a RAR UL grant as described in Clause 8.3  ...  - If the PUSCH transmission is scheduled by a DCI format that does not include an SRI field, or if an *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl* is not provided to the UE, *l* = 0. |   Correspondingly, alignment rules for Rel-17 MTRP PUSCH shall be ensured in accordance with the follows:   * For default P0/Alpha, it is natural to take the first and second values in P0-AlphaSet for two TRPs, respectively. * For default PL-RS, when enablePL-RS-UpdateForPUSCH-SRS is configured, PL-RS Ids for two TRPs should be the PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id value being 0 and 1, respectively. Otherwise, PL-RS Id for two TRPs should be the PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id mapped with sri-PUSCH-PowerControlId = 0 which associated with the first and second SRS resource set, respectively. * For default closed loop index, when twoPUSCH-PC-AdjustmentStates is configured, closed loop index equals to 0 and 1 applied for two TRPs, respectively. Otherwise, closed loop index equal to 0 is applied for both TRPs.   Based on the above elaboration, it can be seen that Alt. 3 is most in line with the legacy rules to minimize specification change/effort, but Alt. 1 does deviated from the current design in Rel-15/16, because the RRC-configured mapping between SRI and PUSCH is mandatory, which is inconsistent with the case of default PC parameters in Rel-15/16. Therefore, it makes sense to adopt Alt. 3 as the solution on default PC parameters for Rel-17 MTRP PUSCH repetition. |
| **OPPO** | Support the proposal and prefer Alt.1 for its simplicity |
| **Fraunhofer IIS/HHI** | Support Alt. 3. Agree with ZTE’s views on alignment with legacy behavior. |
| **Xiaomi** | Prefer alt.1 for the simplicity and flexibility |
| **InterDigital** | Prefer Alt. 1, we think it’s more straightforward to use the SRI to PUSCH power control mapping. |
| **Intel** | Prefer Alt.2. We share the same view as DCM. We need to consider the case where SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl is not provided. |
| **Futurewei** | Alt 1 is a simple and clear solution which works well. |
| **FL update#1** | Added views as below. If companies are ok with Alt.3, I did not list them on other alternatives which do not have good support.  **Alt.1 – QC, Mtek, E///, HW, OPPO, Xiaomi, FW**  **Alt. 2 – Apple, Intel**  **Alt. 3 – LG, Lenovo, DCM, Fujitsu, SS, vivo, CMCC, Nokia, CATT, ZTE, Fraunhofer**  The situation is clear on majority support, we need to pick a solution. Let’s go with majority view.  **Proposal 3.2:** For single-DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition schemes, when one SRS resource per SRS resource set is configured (i.e., when two SRI fields are absent in DCI formats 0\_1 / 0\_2), per TRP default P0, alpha, PL-RS, and closed loop index is defined by,   * + If the UE is provided*enablePL-RS-UpdateForPUSCH-SRS*, the first set of values {the first value in *P0-AlphaSet*, the PL-RS corresponding to the first *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* associated with the first SRS resource set and closed-loop index *l* = 0} is used for TRP1, and the second set of values {the second value in *P0-AlphaSet*, the PL-RS corresponding to the first *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* associated with the second SRS resource set and closed-loop index *l* = 1 if  *twoPUSCH-PC-AdjustmentStates* is configured, *l*=0 otherwise} is used for TRP2.   + Otherwise, the first set of values {the first value in *P0-AlphaSet*, the PL-RS with *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id=0* and closed-loop index *l* = 0} can be used for TRP1, and the second set of values {the second value in P0-AlphaSet, the PL-RS with *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id*= 1 and closed-loop index *l* = 1 if  *twoPUSCH-PC-AdjustmentStates* is configured, *l*=0 otherwise } can be used for TRP2.   + Note: How to design the signaling link sri-PUSCH-PowerControl with two SRS resource sets is up to RAN2. |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Support FL’s latest proposal. |
| **TCL** | Support Alt1. We think it is simpler in term of spec impact. |
| **CATT** | Support the proposal. |
| **QC** | As commented during GTW, we would like to understand the benefit of Alt3 over Alt1 other than RRC configuration overhead reduction. Do we even need to discuss the case that sri-PUSCH-PowerControl is not configured for mTRP given that various other RRC configurations should be configured to enable mTRP PUSCH anyway? What is the use case? |
| **Apple** | If we want to choose the simplest way, Alt2 should be the best one. |
| **ZTE** | Support Alt. 3, which is the simplest in fact and most in line with the legacy rules in Rel-15/16 from the perspective of spec change/effort. |
| **LG** | Alt1 needs more complicated UE implementation than Alt3. This is because, if Alt 1 is agreed, not only Alt 1 but also Rel-16 default PC behavior which is the same as Alt 3 except 2nd TRP part should be implemented in Rel-17 UE for the case the UE is serviced in Rel-16 network. |
| **MediaTek** | Support Alt. 1. For signaling design, we think simplicity and flexibility are more important than aligning with the legacy behavior. |
| **Vivo** | Support Alt.3.  We think the smallest sets of RRC configurations for mTRP PUSCH repetition is two SRS resource sets. Other RRC parameters can follow the legacy configuration, i.e., must be configured or may not configured as Rel-15/16. What we need to do is to specify the behavior when it is not configured by RRC for mTRP cases. That is, now that sri-PUSCH-PowerControl may not be configured for STRP, it may not be configured for mTRP either. |
| **Fujitsu** | Support the latest FL proposal. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Support FL proposal. Also fine with Alt.2. We share similar understanding with vivo that sri-PUSCH-PowerControl may not be configured for STRP, we don’t see why it will always be configured for mTRP. |
| **Xiaomi** | Support Alt.1. We don’t think legacy behavior needs to be considered the most. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | Support alt 1. |
| **CMCC** | Support FL’s latest proposal. |
| **Nokia/NSB** | Ok with the FL version. |
| **OPPO** | Support Alt.1 since Alt.3 is too complicated and without clear benefits. |
| **Fl Update #2** | **Alt.1 – QC, Mtek, E///, HW, OPPO, Xiaomi, FW, TCL**  **Alt. 2 – Apple, Intel**  **Alt. 3 – LG, Lenovo, DCM, Fujitsu, SS, Vivo, CMCC, Nokia, CATT, ZTE, Fraunhofer**  Alt.3 is the majority view.  **Proposal 3.2:** For single-DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition schemes, when one SRS resource per SRS resource set is configured (i.e., when two SRI fields are absent in DCI formats 0\_1 / 0\_2), per TRP default P0, alpha, PL-RS, and closed loop index is defined by,   * + If the UE is provided*enablePL-RS-UpdateForPUSCH-SRS*, the first set of values {the first value in *P0-AlphaSet*, the PL-RS corresponding to the first *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* associated with the first SRS resource set and closed-loop index *l* = 0} is used for TRP1, and the second set of values {the second value in *P0-AlphaSet*, the PL-RS corresponding to the first *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* associated with the second SRS resource set and closed-loop index *l* = 1 if  *twoPUSCH-PC-AdjustmentStates* is configured, *l*=0 otherwise} is used for TRP2.   + Otherwise, the first set of values {the first value in *P0-AlphaSet*, the PL-RS with *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id=0* and closed-loop index *l* = 0} can be used for TRP1, and the second set of values {the second value in P0-AlphaSet, the PL-RS with *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id*= 1 and closed-loop index *l* = 1 if  *twoPUSCH-PC-AdjustmentStates* is configured, *l*=0 otherwise } can be used for TRP2.   + Note: How to design the signaling link sri-PUSCH-PowerControl with two SRS resource sets is up to RAN2. |
| Intel | In the current spec. default values do not depend on configuration of *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl* and we are not sure why we need to change this basic principle. |
| QC | We do not understand comment from LG “Alt1 needs more complicated UE implementation than Alt3”. With Alt1, UE reads all parameters from RRC param “*SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl*”. What is more complicated compared to other Alts?  We do not understand the comment from vivo “That is, now that sri-PUSCH-PowerControl may not be configured for STRP, it may not be configured for mTRP either.” For sTRP the default rule is also for fallback DCI, but we cannot schedule mTRP PUSCH with fallback DCI. Does this logic result in allowing fallback DCI to schedule mTRP PUSCH? |
| LG | @QC: Rel-17 UE with Alt1 should also support legacy default PC behavior. It means two different algorithm needs to be implemented. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support the latest FL proposal. |
| QC | @LG: Alt3 also requires new implementation. The difference is that in Alt1, all parameters are obtained from “*SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl*” while in Alt3, depending on the condition, UE needs to look at various configurations for the second TRP (including sri-PUSCH-PowerControl in the first bullet of Alt3). So if anything, Alt3 is more complicated. |
| ZTE | Support FL update#2. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Support |
| **TCL** | We share the same view as QC. Comparing with Alt1, Alt3 is more complicated. |
| **Vivo** | Support FL update#2.  @QC: in Rel-16, the *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* can be absent even for DCI format 0\_1and 0\_2. For the fallback DCI, we haven’t agreed whether it can be used for MTRP PUSCH repetition. In our opinion, fallback DCI cannot used to schedule the MTRP PUSCH repetition. |
| **QC** | @vivo: That is exactly the point wrt the logic that “That is, now that sri-PUSCH-PowerControl may not be configured for STRP, it may not be configured for mTRP either.” |
| **Vivo** | @QC: our logic is that the configuration of sri-PUSCH-PowerControl is independent on MTRP PUSCH configuration. And Alt.1 changes UE’s behavior of determining the default PC parameters, that is, for STRP transmission, if the CC is configured as STRP PUSCH transmission, the default PC parameters are decided as R16 when sri-PUSCH-PowerControl is not configured; while for STRP transmission in the CC configured as MTRP PUSCH transmission, there is no default PC parameters. |
| **CATT** | Support FL update#2. |
| **Fl Update #5** | We need to close this by selecting one solution. From FL perspective, Alt. 1 and Alt.3 can still work (not considering alt.2 as only two companies support it). Given the slight majority, suggest the group to consider Alt.3.  **Proposal 3.2:** For single-DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition schemes, when one SRS resource per SRS resource set is configured (i.e., when two SRI fields are absent in DCI formats 0\_1 / 0\_2), per TRP default P0, alpha, PL-RS, and closed loop index is defined by,   * + If the UE is provided*enablePL-RS-UpdateForPUSCH-SRS*, the first set of values {the first value in *P0-AlphaSet*, the PL-RS corresponding to the first *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* associated with the first SRS resource set and closed-loop index *l* = 0} is used for TRP1, and the second set of values {the second value in *P0-AlphaSet*, the PL-RS corresponding to the first *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* associated with the second SRS resource set and closed-loop index *l* = 1 if  *twoPUSCH-PC-AdjustmentStates* is configured, *l*=0 otherwise} is used for TRP2.   + Otherwise, the first set of values {the first value in *P0-AlphaSet*, the PL-RS with *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id=0* and closed-loop index *l* = 0} can be used for TRP1, and the second set of values {the second value in P0-AlphaSet, the PL-RS with *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id*= 1 and closed-loop index *l* = 1 if  *twoPUSCH-PC-AdjustmentStates* is configured, *l*=0 otherwise } can be used for TRP2.   + Note: How to design the signaling link sri-PUSCH-PowerControl with two SRS resource sets is up to RAN2. |
| **Xiaomi** | Agree with intel and QC, we prefer Alt.1. Simplicity and flexibility is also very important in our view. |
| **Futurewei** | We prefer Alt1 as it is simpler than Alt3. However we think both can be made to work. Is it possible to leave this for RAN2 to decide? |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Support the proposal which is Alt 3 since it’s a straight extensional way of the legacy way to determine power control parameter set if SRI is not present. |

Issue #3.3: PHR reporting

**Original Proposal 3.3-2:** For option 4, support the following,

* For single cell PHR reporting,
  + When PHR is triggered for at least one TRP (TRP1 and/or TRP2) and m-TRP PUSCH repetitions scheduled by the DCI are towards TRP1 and TRP2, the reported two PHRs correspond to TRP1 and TRP2 are actual PHRs.
  + When PHR is triggered for TRP1 and S-TRP PUSCH transmission (or repetitions) scheduled by the DCI is toward TRP1, the reported PHR correspond to TRP1 is an actual PHR and the reported PHR correspond to TRP2 is a virtual PHR.
  + When PHR is triggered for TRP1 but no PUSCH transmission scheduled by the DCI towards TRP1, PHR is not reported.
* For multi cell PHR reporting,
  + When the PUSCH carrying PHR in one CC (CC1) overlap with at least one m-TRP PUSCH repetitions of other CC (CC2),
    - If the overlapping is with m-TRP PUSCH repetitions associated with both TRPs, two actual PHRs are calculated for TRP1 and TRP2 based on the first (earliest) repetition corresponding to each TRP in CC2 that overlaps with the first slot in which the PUSCH carrying PHR in CC1.
    - If the overlapping is with m-TRP PUSCH repetitions associated with one TRP (TRP1), the actual PHR is calculated for TRP1 based on the first (earliest) repetition in CC2 that overlaps with the first slot in which the PUSCH carrying PHR in CC1, and virtual PHR is calculated for the other TRP (TRP2).
  + When the PUSCH carrying PHR in one CC (CC1) does not overlap with at least one M-TRP PUSCH repetitions of other CC (CC2), legacy procedure applied.
* Note: Actual PHR is calculated based on the first PUSCH occasion towards the PUSCH-receiving TRP while virtual PHR is calculated based on a set of default power control parameters defined for the non-receiving TRP.

Please comment on preferred changes to the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **QC** | Do not support Proposal 3.3-1 in the current form due to the concerns explained in our Tdoc (UE complexity, several ambiguities, and specification impacts). Furthermore, as evident from other Tdocs, different companies have different understandings regarding Option 4, and the complexity/spec impact of different proposals are not the same.  Given these concerns, and also the fact that option 4 has majority support, we can accept option 4 if   * Option 4 is optional UE capability. A UE should be able to support mTRP PUSCH repetitions w/o having to support Option 4 for PHR * Option 4 is made simple w/o two actual PHRs unless if both are in the same slot (more explanation regarding this below)   For proposal 3.3-1: Based on the above, we suggest the following to move forwards:  **Proposal 3.3-1:** For PHR reporting related to M-TRP PUSCH repetition, support Option 4 as UE optional capability,   * Option 4: Calculate two PHRs (at least corresponding to the CC that applies m-TRP PUSCH repetitions), each associated with a first PUSCH occasion to each TRP, and report two PHRs.   If UE does not support Option 4 for PHR, one PHR associated with the first PUSCH occasion (earliest repetition that overlaps with the first slot in which the PUSCH that carries the PHR MAC-CE is transmitted) is reported.  For Proposal 3.3.2: Assuming that Option 4 is optional UE capability as suggested above, we are ok with the general direction of this proposal. However, we wanted to mention a few points:   * Regarding “PHR is triggered for at least one TRP” or “PHR is triggered for TRP1”, given that PHR configurations are per cell group (common to all CCs), we prefer to not introduce per-TRP PHR triggering. From the MAC layer perspective, existing triggering mechanisms are enough. Otherwise, there will be significant RAN2 impact. * We prefer to have the same unified design for both non-CA and CA case. Otherwise, we also have to treat two cases for UL-CA differently: Whether mTRP PUSCH carries MAC-CE or another CC carries the MAC-CE * In the current spec, actual overlap of PUSCH with MAC-CE and other PUSCHs is not important. Instead, whether they are in the same slot or not is important. Same principle should be maintained here for the conditions that the second PHR can be actual. * PHR reporting for sTRP CCs or sTRP PUSCHs should not be impacted. * Second PHR value is reported only when the first PHR value is not virtual   Given the above, we suggest to focus on a simple proposal that also reuses Rel. 15/16 mechanisms as much as possible:  **Proposal 3.3-2:** For option 4, support the following: When PHR MAC-CE is reported in slot n, for a CC that is configured with mTRP PUSCH repetition, PHR value(s) are determined as   * The first PHR value is reported same as Rel. 15/16. * If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions associated with a given TRP   + The second PHR value is actual PHR only when a repetition associated with the other TRP is transmitted in slot n.   + Otherwise, the second PHR value is virtual PHR: calculated based on a set of default power control parameters defined for the other TRP (that is not associated with the first PHR) * If the first PHR value is virtual, a second PHR value is not reported |
| **LG** | **Support the proposal 3.3-1. P3.3-2 can be discussed after 3.3-1 is agreed so we prefer to focus on 3.3-1.** |
| **MediaTek** | **Support Proposal 3.3-1 and fine with QC’s revision on Proposal 3.3-1. We also prefer to focus on Proposal 3.3-1 first.** |
| **Apple** | **Support proposal 3.3-1 and 3.3-2 revised by QC.** |
| **Ericsson** | **We support FL’s proposal 3.3-1. Regarding QC’s revision to Proposal 3.3-1, is it QC’s intention to support multiple solutions based on UE capability? In QC’s revision, it seems like if the UE supports the optional capability, then option 4 is supported; if the UE doesn’t support the capability, then Option 1 is supported? It may be better to avoid agreeing to multiple solutions in this way.**  **We also prefer to focus on Proposal 3.3-1 first, and the next level of details in Proposal 3.3-2 can be discussed once Proposal 3.3-1 is agreed.** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support 3.3-1. Also prefer to focus on 3.3-1 first.**  **For 3.3-2, we think per TRP PHR triggering needs to be discussed first, otherwise, how to determine PHR is triggered for TRP1 or TRP2 is not clear.** |
| **Samsung** | **Support the proposal 3.3-1. For the proposal 3.3-2, we support the proposal in principle. We also agree to focus on Proposal 3.3-1 first.** |
| **Vivo** | **Support Proposal 3.3-1.**  **For Proposal 3.3-2, we prefer a unified design with modification below:**  **Proposal 3.3-2:** For option 4, support the following,   * For single cell PHR reporting,   + When PHR is triggered for at least one TRP (TRP1 and/or TRP2) and m-TRP PUSCH repetitions scheduled by the DCI are towards TRP1 and TRP2, the reported two PHRs correspond to TRP1 and TRP2 are actual PHRs.   + When PHR is triggered ~~for TRP1 and~~ S-TRP PUSCH transmission (or repetitions) scheduled by the DCI is toward TRP1, the reported PHR correspond to TRP1 is an actual PHR and the reported PHR correspond to TRP2 is a virtual PHR.   + When PHR is triggered S-TRP PUSCH transmission (or repetitions) scheduled by the DCI is toward TRP2, the reported PHR correspond to TRP1 is an virtual PHR and the reported PHR correspond to TRP2 is a actual PHR.   + ~~When PHR is triggered for TRP1 but no PUSCH transmission scheduled by the DCI towards TRP1, PHR is not reported.~~ * For multi cell PHR reporting,   + When the PUSCH carrying PHR in one CC (CC1) overlap with at least one m-TRP PUSCH repetitions of other CC (CC2),     - If the overlapping is with m-TRP PUSCH repetitions associated with both TRPs, two actual PHRs are calculated for TRP1 and TRP2 based on the first (earliest) repetition corresponding to each TRP in CC2 that overlaps with the first slot in which the PUSCH carrying PHR in CC1.     - If the overlapping is with m-TRP PUSCH repetitions associated with one TRP (TRP1/TRP2), the actual PHR is calculated for TRP1 based on the first (earliest) repetition in CC2 that overlaps with the first slot in which the PUSCH carrying PHR in CC1, and virtual PHR is calculated for the other TRP (TRP2/TRP1).   + When the PUSCH carrying PHR in one CC (CC1) does not overlap with at least one M-TRP PUSCH repetitions of other CC (CC2), legacy procedure applied. * Note: Actual PHR is calculated based on the first PUSCH occasion towards the PUSCH-receiving TRP while virtual PHR is calculated based on a set of default power control parameters defined for the non-receiving TRP. |
| **Nokia** | **We share other companies’ view to first focus on the support of 3.3-1.**  **As commented by DOCOMO, we should also clarify the triggering aspect.**  **In general, we prefer to not have the multi-TRP PHR enhancements as UE capability for similar reasons mentioned by Ericsson.** |
| **CATT** | **Whether per TRP PHR triggering is supported and how to determine which TRP the PHR is triggered for should be clarified first.** |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Support both proposals 3.3-1 and 3.3-2.**  **For 3.3-2, we can firstly decide whether separate PHR triggering per TRP is needed. For simplicity, it can be supported without signaling impact on RAN2.** |
| **ZTE** | **For proposal 3.3-1, we can be supportive of it. Although our preference is option 2, we can live with option 4 which at least can support per TRP PHR reporting and supported by majority. However, we fail to see the logical to treat option 4 as UE optional capability.**  **For proposal 3.3-2, we agree with DOCOMO’s assessment.** |
| **OPPO** | We are generally ok with the proposal.  For proposal 3.3-2, there 6 cases listed under different conditions such as single cell and multi-cell which complicated the specification. Thus, we are also open to any simple solution to cover all cases. |
| **Convida Wireless** | **Support both proposals 3.3-1 and 3.3-2.** |
| **FGI/APT** | **Support proposal 3.3-1 and we should focus on the proposal 3.3-1 first. For proposal 3.3.2, we share the similar view as DOCOMO.** |
| **Xiaomi** | **We are generally okay with both proposals 3.3-1 and 3.3-2** |
| **InterDigital** | **Support proposal 3.3-1. We may further discuss 3.3-2 if proposal 3.3-1 is agreed.** |
| **Intel** | **We have similar view as many companies that we can focus on 3.3-1 first. We prefer the FL version because QC revision creates 2 solutions to address the same problem. Let us try to not create such multiple solutions every time there is a minority opinion.** |
| **Futurewei** | **We prefer Proposal 3.3-1 suggested by QC.** |
| **FL update #1** | Majority of companies support 3.3-1. On 3.3.-2, it seems companies wish to discuss more prior agreeing to any method. Other than QC, everyone else is ok with the current form of the proposal 3.3-1.  **Original Proposal 3.3-1:** For PHR reporting related to M-TRP PUSCH repetition, support Option 4,   * Option 4: Calculate two PHRs (at least corresponding to the CC that applies m-TRP PUSCH repetitions), each associated with a first PUSCH occasion to each TRP, and report two PHRs.   Concerns: QC  The update from QC seems applicable to multiple companies, even though few others raise concerns.  **Updated Proposal 3.3-1:** For PHR reporting related to M-TRP PUSCH repetition, support Option 4 as UE optional capability,   * Option 4: Calculate two PHRs (at least corresponding to the CC that applies m-TRP PUSCH repetitions), each associated with a first PUSCH occasion to each TRP, and report two PHRs. * If UE does not support Option 4 for PHR, one PHR associated with the first PUSCH occasion (earliest repetition that overlaps with the first slot in which the PUSCH that carries the PHR MAC-CE is transmitted) is reported.   **@All.** Please check whether updated proposal 3.3.-1 is acceptable to you as it allows closing this to progress towards details. I will update the 3.3-2 based on outcome. Also, provide your views on that to further refine earlier version of FL proposal 3.3-2 and QC revision on that. |
| **FL update #2** | Thanks for accepting proposal 3.3-1. Let’s continue discussion with Proposal 3.3-2.  It seems that the updated version on proposal 3.3-2 sent by QC got some support in the phase0 discussions. Also, “*per TRP PHR triggering’* is avoided in that version of the proposal. Also, “*per TRP PHR triggering”* seems to be another controversial aspect when reporting two PHRs. At the end, we shall also look into reasonable scope for RAN2 and not add too much burden on them. Therefore, FL also thinks that suggested version from QC can be considered for further discussion.  **Proposal 3.3-2:** For option 4, support the following:  When PHR MAC-CE is reported in slot n, for a CC that is configured with mTRP PUSCH repetition, PHR value(s) are determined as,   * The first PHR value is reported same as Rel. 15/16. * If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions associated with a given TRP   + The second PHR value is actual PHR only when a repetition associated with the other TRP is transmitted in slot n.   + Otherwise, the second PHR value is virtual PHR: calculated based on a set of default power control parameters defined for the other TRP (that is not associated with the first PHR) * If the first PHR value is virtual, a second PHR value is not reported |
| **CATT** | If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions associated with a given TRP, we prefer to calculate actual PHR for the second PHR value if M-TRP PUSCH transmission is scheduled, at least for the case there is a PUSCH repetition for TRP associated to the second PHR in slot n or before slot n. |
| **Apple** | Support the latest proposal 3.3-2 |
| **ZTE** | Generally, we think the aspect of “per TRP PHR reporting” should be supported, because per TRP RRC-configured PC parameters has been agreed. Note that “change in PL-RS received power” is one of PHR triggering events in Rel-15/16, it is unreasonable to preclude such event as TRP specific when per TRP PL-RS can be indicated. Based on the above elaboration, it is very puzzling why only support “per TRP PHR reporting” and “per TRP PC parameters configuration” but without “per TRP PHR reporting” for Rel-17 MTRP PUSCH scheme.  Regarding proposal 3.3-2, we share similar view with CATT, which is benefit to scheduling from gNB side due to PC parameters towards two TRPs can be pre-configured for PHR calculation. |
| **LG** | We have similar understanding with CATT. Second PHR can be actual PHR if corresponding PUSCH TO is no later than slot n. Also, on the last bullet, if first PHR is virtual and second virtual PHR can be reported as well. The following is our suggestion.  **Proposal 3.3-2:** For option 4, support the following:  When PHR MAC-CE is reported in slot n, for a CC that is configured with mTRP PUSCH repetition, PHR value(s) are determined as,   * The first PHR value is reported same as Rel. 15/16. * If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions associated with a given TRP   + The second PHR value is actual PHR only when a repetition associated with the other TRP is transmitted ~~in~~no later than slot n.   + Otherwise, the second PHR value is virtual PHR: calculated based on a set of default power control parameters defined for the other TRP (that is not associated with the first PHR) * If the first PHR value is virtual, a second PHR value is virtual and the two PHR are reported ~~not reported~~ |
| **MediaTek** | We share a similar view as CATT that the second PHR is better to be actual PHR. We think the reference transmission occasion may not be very critical. We propose the following alternative for the first sub-bullet:  The second PHR value is actual PHR for a repetition of the same PUSCH associated with the other TRP. The repetition to calculate actual PHR is up to UE implementation.  We are fine with LG’s revision on the 3rd bullet but it should be a sub-bullet of the 2nd bullet. |
| **Convida Wireless** | Support the latest proposal 3.3-2. |
| **Samsung** | First of all, proposal 3.3-2 in update#2 seems only for the multi-cell PHR reporting. In current proposal 3.3-2, we cannot report two actual PHRs for single-cell PHR report because the PHR for TRP that is not associated with the first transmission occasion cannot be calculated as actual PHR. So, we want to add the previous proposal for single-cell PHR reporting (we are okay with vivo’s version for single-cell PHR reporting)  For the clarification, does “reported same as Rel. 15/16” include the timeline condition to determine actual PHR or virtual PHR? We think the timeline condition is important for the UE to decide the PHR calculation method.  We agree that the first PHR value is same as Rel. 15/16 for the multi-cell PHR reporting but we think that the UE can calculate actual PHR for second PHR value even though the corresponding slot is not slot n (earlier or later than slot n). The UE received scheduling information (DCI or configured grant before the timeline condition as Rel. 15/16) and all power control information can be acquired by UE. So, PHR calculation instance would be slot n but at that time (slot n), UE can calculate the second PHR value as actual PHR based on scheduling information (two SRI or two TPC etc.) because UE already received scheduling DCI. |
| **NTT Docomo** | We are fine with LG’s revision. |
| **Xiaomi** | LG’s version is fine to us, besides the same understanding with CATT, we think both virtual PH values should be reported which still benefit the NW scheduling. |
| **Vivo** | We don’t support the Proposal 3.3-2 in FL update #2, we have similar view as Samsung.  In current spec, PHR for multi-CCs are separately described. Companies may have different opinions on multi-CC case. So we recommend to agree on single-CC case from the original proposal which is easier to agree on in this meeting.  **Proposal 3.3-2:** For option 4, support the following,   * For single cell PHR reporting,   + When PHR is triggered for at least one TRP (TRP1 and/or TRP2) and m-TRP PUSCH repetitions scheduled by the DCI are towards TRP1 and TRP2, the reported two PHRs correspond to TRP1 and TRP2 are actual PHRs.   + When PHR is triggered ~~for TRP1 and~~ S-TRP PUSCH transmission (or repetitions) scheduled by the DCI is toward TRP1, the reported PHR correspond to TRP1 is an actual PHR and the reported PHR correspond to TRP2 is a virtual PHR.   + When PHR is triggered S-TRP PUSCH transmission (or repetitions) scheduled by the DCI toward TRP2, the reported PHR corresponds to TRP1 is a virtual PHR and the reported PHR corresponds to TRP2 is an actual PHR.   + ~~When PHR is triggered for TRP1 but no PUSCH transmission scheduled by the DCI towards TRP1, PHR is not reported.~~ * FFS: For multi cell PHR reporting~~,~~   + ~~When the PUSCH carrying PHR in one CC (CC1) overlap with at least one m-TRP PUSCH repetitions of other CC (CC2),~~     - ~~If the overlapping is with m-TRP PUSCH repetitions associated with both TRPs, two actual PHRs are calculated for TRP1 and TRP2 based on the first (earliest) repetition corresponding to each TRP in CC2 that overlaps with the first slot in which the PUSCH carrying PHR in CC1.~~     - ~~If the overlapping is with m-TRP PUSCH repetitions associated with one TRP (TRP1/TRP2), the actual PHR is calculated for TRP1 based on the first (earliest) repetition in CC2 that overlaps with the first slot in which the PUSCH carrying PHR in CC1, and virtual PHR is calculated for the other TRP (TRP2/TRP1).~~   + ~~When the PUSCH carrying PHR in one CC (CC1) does not overlap with at least one M-TRP PUSCH repetitions of other CC (CC2), legacy procedure applied.~~   Note: Actual PHR is calculated based on the first PUSCH occasion towards the PUSCH-receiving TRP while virtual PHR is calculated based on a set of default power control parameters defined for the non-receiving TRP. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | We share similar views with other companies that when the first PHR is actual PHR, the second PHR can be actual PHR which is beneficial to gNB scheduling.  For proposal 3.3-2 in update#2, we would like to understand what “the first PHR” is, does that mean “The triggered PHR”? If so, then the transmission time is not so relevant with actual or virtual, therefore, a modification is proposed as below:  **Proposal 3.3-2:** For option 4, support the following:  When PHR MAC-CE is reported in slot n, for a CC that is configured with mTRP PUSCH repetition, PHR value(s) are determined as,   * The first PHR value is reported same as Rel. 15/16. * If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions associated with a given TRP   + The second PHR value is actual PHR when PUSCH in slot n is mTRP based repetition ~~only when a repetition associated with the other TRP is transmitted in slot n~~.   + Otherwise, the second PHR value is virtual PHR: calculated based on a set of default power control parameters defined for the other TRP (that is not associated with the first PHR) * If the first PHR value is virtual, a second PHR value is ~~not~~ reported as virtual PHR. |
| **Nokia** | We share a similar view as Samsung that the UE could calculate actual PHR also for the second PHR value regardless of whether the corresponding slot is later than slot n or not.  On the other side, our assumption is that the latest FL’s proposal covers both single cell case as well as CA case. We would be fine to further clarify this aspect if preferred by some companies. |
| **OPPO** | We think proposal 3.3-2 should be clarified that the rules can be both applied in single cell and multi cell PHR reporting. For multi-cell PHR reporting, we think that reporting of actual or virtual PHR depends on the overlapping of MTRP PUSCH and PUSCH carrying PHR.  For the 3rd bullet in updated proposal 3.3-2, the second virtual PHR can also be reported. A union solution for calculating and reporting PHR is easier for the readability and design of spec.  Moreover, we think the PHR reporting corresponding to S-TRP PUSCH transmission should be included |
| **FL Update #3** | Not addressing all comments one by one as the directions of the comments seems to be the same.  Multiple companies (**CATT, LG, DCM, Xiaomi, Mtek, SS, HW, Nokia**) suggesting that the second PHR is actual PHR when the PUSCH in slot n is m-TRP PUSCH repetition (second TRP repetition may be in slot n-1, n+2). Used HW suggestion with some edits.  @**SS** >> *does “reported same as Rel. 15/16” include the timeline condition to determine actual PHR or virtual PHR?* When we say, “same as Rel-15/16” and not defining any new timeline conditions, legacy conditions shall be applied. Please indicate if any specific changes that group is aware of.  @**HW** >> *“For proposal 3.3-2 in update#2, we would like to understand what “the first PHR” is, does that mean “The triggered PHR”?”* Yes, that is correct.  @**ZTE**>> per TRP triggering is not supported by many other companies. FL thinks this may be the maximum we could do for PHR reporting in Rel-17 as otherwise workload for RAN2 could be high.  @**vivo, Oppo** >> main bullet covers both single CC and multi-CC scenario as it is generic ‘a CC’. Let’s not go back to earlier version. FL thinks that this version is much closer to get an agreement.  **Updated Proposal 3.3-2:** For option 4, support the following:  When PHR MAC-CE is reported in slot n, for a CC that is configured with mTRP PUSCH repetition, PHR value(s) are determined as,   * The first PHR value is reported same as Rel. 15/16. * If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions associated with a given TRP   + The second PHR value is actual PHR only when PUSCH in slot n is a repetition among mTRP repetitions associated with any TRP. ~~associated with the other TRP is transmitted in slot n.~~   + Otherwise, the second PHR value is virtual PHR: calculated based on a set of default power control parameters defined for the other TRP (that is not associated with the first PHR) * If the first PHR value is virtual, a second PHR value is ~~not~~ reported as virtual PHR. |
| Intel | In principle we are okay with the FL proposal (also agree with Samsung) with the following clarifications   * applicable to both single entry and multi-entry PHR reports * for single entry PHR, support actual PHR for second TRP since DCI is known (for mTRP repetition case)   we also support per TRP trigger, we can send LS to RAN2 with the decision so they can follow up  **FL: I think the above is applicable for both single entry and multi-entry. I could added a note on that. Second TRP is actual PHR with the above update already. Per TRP trigger is a separate discussion that we do not have common view among companies. We can send an LS to RAN2 with the agreement we made on above proposal.** |
| QC | With the updated text, does it mean that if the first PHR is actual and for a mTRP repetition, the second PHR is also actual always? If yes, then how do we determine the PUSCH occasion for the second actual PHR?    In the figure above, it makes a difference whether PUSCH repetition in slot n-1 or n+2 is selected because MPR value (which is reported for actual PHR) can be different in UL-CA (irrespective of single-entry or multiple-entry PHR).  **FL: As we are not defining which transmission is assumed for second TRP, it can be any slot as you mentioned. LG suggest using only future slots. But there are several companies mentioning that it is up to UE implementation to select which slot they wish to use to calculate PHR. Overall change of MPR or PHR may not be change significantly based on company views that I heard. Even that get changed, I assume UE implementation would handle it by reporting the max.**  Our reading of HW’s comment is that the intention is not the above, but maybe HW can clarify.  In any case, we suggest the FL proposal in “**FL update #2**” to avoid these issues as well as excessive UE complexity issue for PHR calculation. |
| LG | How does UE calculate actual 2nd PHR if transmission occasion for 2nd TRP is later than slot n, according to latest FL proposal (based on HW revision)? In that case, UE does not know actual transmission power in the transmission occasion for 2nd TRP so 2nd PHR should be virtual PHR from our understanding. We suggest to go back to our revised proposal.  **FL: Please check my comment above for QC. In some cases, there may be no transmissions for second TRP after slot n. Spec change wise, what HW suggest is easier and UE implementation can handle which one to select if there is a situation that QC provided above.** |
| ZTE | We still have strong concern on why only support “per TRP PHR reporting” and “per TRP PC parameters configuration” but without “per TRP PHR reporting” for Rel-17 MTRP PUSCH scheme, that is very weird. We suggest to send one LS to RAN2 in this meeting to evaluate it.  Support FL’s updated proposal 3.3-2.  **FL: we can discuss per TRP triggering when others have similar suggestions. But it is not the case. In any case, you seem to be ok with the updated version.** |
| NTT Docomo | We are fine with LG’s revision is last round. |
| FGI/APT | We also fine with LG’s revision. |
| Samsung | First of all, we want to clarify the PHR calculation instance. As our understanding, UE will calculate PHRs for multi-cell during preparation time for PUSCH transmission occasion in slot n. So, if UE knows that PUSCH transmission on CC2 is mTRP based PUSCH transmission, UE can also calculate second PHR on CC2 based on DCI (which includes two SRI fields and two TPC fields) when UE calculate first PHR on CC2. Only concern is ‘MPR value’ because PUSCH toward TRP2 is not transmitted in slot n.    In Rel-16, PUSCH repetition with sTRP is supported and let us assume the following example:    We think the current specification also cannot report all the condition on CC2. Values of actual transmission power on slot n-1, slot n and slot n+2 are different. But, PHR calculation is done at slot n and that can be the reference occasion for the PHR calculation even though the actual PHR cannot represent all the actual transmission power (slot n-1 or slot n+2). So, similarly, for supporting PHR for both TRPs, we can calculate PHR values at slot n and the calculation is based on two SRI fields and two TPC fields in a DCI.  And we prefer Updated Proposal 3.3-2 (FL Update#3). |
| ASUSTeK | We are also fine with LG’s revision.  Regarding updated proposal 3.3-2 in **FL Update #3**, if the second bullet is true (i.e., the first PHR value is actual PHR), the first sub-bullet seems always true since there exists PUSCH in slot n. If our understanding is correct, the second sub-bullet would not occur.  Besides, we also think per TRP PHR triggering should be discussed, e.g. for pathloss change, power backoff change, etc, and we share the same view with Intel that we can send LS to RAN2 and decision of whether to have per TRP PHR triggering could up to RAN2.  FL: Please also refer to comments above under QC and LG. |
| Fl update #4 | Some comments added to QC, LG, Intel,ASUSTeK and ZTE.  **Updated Proposal 3.3-2:** For option 4, support the following:  When PHR MAC-CE is reported in slot n, for a CC that is configured with mTRP PUSCH repetition, PHR value(s) are determined as,   * The first PHR value is reported same as Rel. 15/16. * If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions associated with a given TRP   + The second PHR value is actual PHR only when PUSCH in slot n is a repetition among mTRP repetitions associated with any TRP. ~~associated with the other TRP is transmitted in slot n.~~   + Otherwise, the second PHR value is virtual PHR: calculated based on a set of default power control parameters defined for the other TRP (that is not associated with the first PHR) * If the first PHR value is virtual, a second PHR value is ~~not~~ reported as virtual PHR. * Note: the above is applicable to both single entry and multi-entry PHR reports |
| vivo | We are not sure how the Updated Proposal 3.3-2 works for the following cases:  Case 1:   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | CC1 | Beam1 | Beam2 |  |  | | CC2 |  | Beam2  (report PHR) | Beam1  (report PHR rep) |  | | slot | n-1 | n | n+1 |  |   Based on FL Update #3, on slot n,   * For CC2, the first PHR for beam2 is actual, the second PHR for beam1 is actual * while for CC1, the first PHR for beam1 is virtual as R15/16, so the second PHR for beam2 is virtual as well.   We think this is non-sense as actual PHR should be reported if PUSCHs are overlapped on slot n based on the principle of PHR design.  **FL: Based on proposal you refer. CC2 report the actual PHR in slot n, so the second PHR in CC2 is actual PHR. For CC1, as the first PHR is actual PHR and associated with m-TRP, second PHR also become actual PHR. I am not sure how you interpret virtual PHR for CC1.**  Case 2:  We want to clarify is in which case the first PHR is actual while the second PHR is virtual following the branch of “otherwise”?  **FL: in CC1, if the transmission is s-TRP, there is no PUSCH repetition for m-TRP. So second PHR is virtual.** |
| QC | We are confused about the comments that which PUSCH occasion can be left to UE implementation. The reported value would be different for different occasions. Then, if gNB does not know the corresponding PUSCH occasion for which the PHR value is reported, how will it use the value of actual PHR?  **FL: When the CC1 and CC2 SCS are different, you have situations that CC1 slot n overlap with multiple slots in CC2, to my reading, the FL proposal you referred before also require UE selecting a repetition to calculate second PHR in CC2. Let me know if that is not correct. But, I do see the point of MPR below.**  @ FL: MPR can change significantly depending on the presence of UL transmissions on other CCs according to RAN4 spec (38.101 serries, e.g., 38.101-2 Section 6)  **FL: Understand that MPR may be changed due to CC2 UL transmission. So letting UE selecting the repetition may not fully help. With the same proposal above, we could define how the UE select the slot for second PHR calculation by providing a method of selecting the second repetition (may be n+1 first selection or n-1 second selection)**  @ Samsung: Yes, the difference comes from MPR which is important for actual PHR. Otherwise, we can just report virtual PHR. For single TRP example you mentioned, the specification is completely clear that actual PHR is for exactly which repetition. For repetition TypeA, we only have one repetition per slot. And for repetition TypeB, see the following:    Given thses, we would like to go back to “**FL update #2**” to avoid these issues. |
| Fl update #5 | Based on the comments above, it seems that there are at least two different alternatives we shall further consider,  **Updated Proposal 3.3-2:** For option 4, support the following:  When PHR MAC-CE is reported in slot n, for a CC that is configured with mTRP PUSCH repetition, PHR value(s) are determined as,   * The first PHR value is reported same as Rel. 15/16. * If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions associated with a given TRP   + The second PHR value is actual PHR, select alt. 1 or alt. 2     - Alt.1: only when PUSCH in slot n is a repetition among mTRP repetitions associated with any TRP. When there are more than one repetitions associated with the other TRP, the second PHR is calculated considering on the following repetition,       * If there are repetition(s) towards the other TRP which transmit after the repetition used to calculate first PHR, the UE select the latest repetition among them.       * Otherwise, the UE select the earliest repetition which transmitted before the repetition used to calculate first PHR.     - Alt.2: only when a repetition associated with the other TRP is transmitted in slot n. FFS: The case of more than one PUSCH repetition associated with the other TRP in slot n.   + Otherwise, the second PHR value is virtual PHR: calculated based on a set of default power control parameters defined for the other TRP (that is not associated with the first PHR) * If the first PHR value is virtual, a second PHR value is reported as virtual PHR. * Note: the above is applicable to both single entry and multi-entry PHR reports |
| Futurewei | We are generally fine with the proposal. We are not very clear about the UE autonomous selection of a slot or more slots for computing the 2nd PHR. This seems to be a new behavior and we are not sure how it may actually work in practice. We are open for more discussions. |
| QC | @FL: Agree with your comment “**When the CC1 and CC2 SCS are different, you have situations that CC1 slot n overlap with multiple slots in CC2**”. However, our assumption was that in this case, we just reuse the legacy rule, i.e., the first repetition from TRP2 that is in slot n. With Alt1, the situation is very different, because we need to look at slots in the past and slots in the future and slot n, and then define a rule to select a repetition in any of these slots. Based on this, Alt2 can be clarified as below.  For the bullet “If the first PHR value is virtual, a second PHR value is reported as virtual PHR”, it may be better to also have two Alts. In additions, we realized that when first PHR is actual, but for a sTRP PUSCH (not corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions associated with a given TRP), we may have two alternatives as well.  We suggest the following revision: (including some editorial suggestions to make alts more clear, which shouldn’t change the meaning)  **Updated Proposal 3.3-2:** For option 4, support the following:  When PHR MAC-CE is reported in slot n, for a CC that is configured with mTRP PUSCH repetition, PHR value(s) are determined as,   * The first PHR value is reported same as Rel. 15/16. * If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions associated with a given TRP, the second PHR value ~~is actual PHR~~, select alt. 1 or alt. 2   + Alt.1A: Is always actual. ~~only when PUSCH in slot n is a repetition among mTRP repetitions associated with any TRP~~. When there are more than one repetitions associated with the other TRP, the second PHR is calculated considering on the following repetition,     - If there are repetition(s) towards the other TRP which transmit after the repetition used to calculate first PHR, the UE select the latest repetition among them.     - Otherwise, the UE select the earliest repetition which transmitted before the repetition used to calculate first PHR.   + Alt.2A: Is actual only when a repetition associated with the other TRP is transmitted in slot n. Otherwise, it is virtual.     - If there are multiple repetitions associated with the other TRP in slot n, the earliest one in slot n is selected.   + ~~Otherwise, the second PHR value is virtual PHR: calculated based on a set of default power control parameters defined for the other TRP (that is not associated with the first PHR)~~ * If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) but not corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions (corresponds to sTRP PUSCH)   + Alt1B: a second PHR value is reported as virtual PHR.   + Alt2B: a second PHR is not reported * If the first PHR value is virtual,   + Alt1C: a second PHR value is reported as virtual PHR.   + Alt2C: a second PHR is not reported * When second PHR is virtual, it is calculated based on a set of default power control parameters defined for the other TRP (that is not associated with the first PHR) * Note: the above is applicable to both single entry and multi-entry PHR reports |

Issue #3.4: PT-RS DMRS association

**Proposed conclusion 3.4:** For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH Type B repetition, the indication of PTRS-DMRS association for maxRank > 2 is based on the legacy framework, i.e., the same PTRS-DMRS association field is applied to both TRPs (to both sets of repetitions).

Please comment on preferred changes to the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **QC** | Support the proposal, which is the default assumption in the absence of Options 1-3 (which seemed difficult to converge in the previous meeting) |
| **LG** | **Considering the fact that we agreed to down select one of three options for this issue, we prefer not to revert the agreement. We are open for Option 1 and 3.**  **Agreement**  For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH Type B repetition, the indication of PTRS-DMRS association for maxRank > 2 is supported, down select one of the following options in RAN1 #105-e meeting,   * The support of cyclic mapping can be optional UE feature for the cases when the number of repetitions is larger than 2. * Option 1 (4 bits): with a second PTRS-DMRS association field (similar to the existing field), and each field separately indicating the association between PTRS port and DMRS port for two TRPs. * Option 2 (2 bits): using the existing PTRS-DMRS association field in DCI for the first TRP, and using reserved entries/bits in DM-RS port indication field for the second TRP. * Option 3 (2 bits): 1 bit MSB is used to indicate PTRS-DMRS association for the first TRP, and 1 bit LSB is used to indicate PTRS-DMRS association for the second TRP   + if *maxNrofPorts* = 1, the 1 bit indicates one of the first two DMRS ports.   + if *maxNrofPorts* = 2, the 1 bit indicates one of two DMRS ports sharing the same PTRS port. |
| **Apple** | For NCB case, we think one way is to use a fixed association as DL, since the precoder is selected by UE and UE can map the best precoder to the lowest port index.  For CB case, we think option 1 can provide better performance, if the overhead is really a problem, one possible way is to use PT-RS port cycling. |
| **Ericsson** | Not support the current conclusion. Using the same PTRS-DMRS association to both TRPs is sub-optimal. Plus, the solution in the proposed conclusion is a 4th option that was not part of the previous agreement. We feel it is better to down-select among the 3 options we discussed in the last meeting.  Our preference is Option 3.  ● Option 3 (2 bits): 1 bit MSB is used to indicate PTRS-DMRS association for the first TRP, and 1 bit LSB is used to indicate PTRS-DMRS association for the second TRP  ● if maxNrofPorts = 1, the 1 bit indicates one of the first two DMRS ports.  ● if maxNrofPorts = 2, the 1 bit indicates one of two DMRS ports sharing the same PTRS port. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Support |
| **Spreadtrum** | Support the proposal |
| **Samsung** | For the compromise, we can support Option 3 and Option 1. If RAN1 cannot make convergence, we are open with FL’s proposal. |
| **Vivo** | We share similar view as LG and we prefer Option 3. |
| **CMCC** | Support the proposal. |
| **Nokia** | Support. Share similar view as QC. |
| **CATT** | Although we prefere option 3. The proposal is acceptable to us. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | We are fine with the proposal. |
| **ZTE** | Do NOT support this proposal.  We think the indication of per TRP PTRS-DMRS association should be supported when rank > 2, plus DCI overhead increasing should be avoided as much as possible. For the sake of progress, we can live with option 3 once majority support it, even though our first priority has always been option 2. Hence we suggest to at least list option 3, which supported by many companies, and try to reach a consensus here. |
| **OPPO** | Support the proposal |
| **Xiaomi** | Our preference is option.1, but the FL proposal is acceptable to us for the sake of progress |
| **InterDigital** | Support FL’s proposal. |
| **Intel** | Agree with E/// and LG that we should start from the agreement in the last meeting. We prefer option-3 |
| **Futurewei** | Support |
| **FL Update #1** | Majority of companies are ok with closing this issue with a conclusion.  **@LG, E//, vivo, Intel >>** the proposal is a conclusion that helps formally close this issue. As RAN1 was not able to agree on any alternative listed for last two meetings, but as companies still bring proposals on this with different views (please see the preferences listed even in this round). Therefore, it seems ok to conclude ‘no consensus’. No consensus means legacy behavior applied.  **@ZTE>>** it seems option 3 is ok with you. Apple, QC, Xiaomi, ZTE were objecting option 3 in last meeting. We could try Option 3 one more time.  **@Apple, E// >>** Yes, performance may not be optimized. Let’s try to see agreeing on option 3, which had least objections last time.  **Proposal 3.4:** Select one of the following,  **Alt.1:** For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH Type B repetition, the indication of PTRS-DMRS association for maxRank > 2 is based on the legacy framework, i.e., the same PTRS-DMRS association field is applied to both TRPs (to both sets of repetitions).  *Concerns: please indicate change of views (@ZTE, Apple, E///, LG, vivo, Intel).*  **Alt.2:** For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH Type B repetition, the indication of PTRS-DMRS association for maxRank > 2, 1-bit MSB is used to indicate PTRS-DMRS association for the first TRP, and 1 bit LSB is used to indicate PTRS-DMRS association for the second TRP   * + if *maxNrofPorts* = 1, the 1 bit indicates one of the first two DMRS ports.   + if *maxNrofPorts* = 2, the 1 bit indicates one of two DMRS ports sharing the same PTRS port.   *Concerns: please indicate change of views (@Apple, QC, Xiaomi)* |
| **CATT** | Alt 2 is more preferred than Alt 1. Alt 1 is acceptable for the sake of progress. |
| **QC** | Support Alt1.  Both Alt1 and Alt2 are incomplete (either reduced flexibility across TRPs or within a TRP). Then, why should we bother to complicate the spec with Alt2 given that Alt1 is legacy? |
| **Apple** | We do not support either Alt1 or Alt2. We think the previous 4 bits indication is a good pproach. The performance of current Alt1 and Alt2 may be even worset than PT-RS port cycling.  Our first preference is a 4-bit indication.  If the overhead is a problem, we think we do not need such DCI indication. Then the proposal could be as follows:   * For NCB, the PT-RS portis always fixed to be associated with DMRS port with lowst port index among the DMRS ports that share the same PT-RS port * For CB, the PT-RS portis always fixed to be associated with DMRS port with port index x among the DMRS ports that share the same PT-RS port, where x is the repetition index mod total number of DMRS ports that share the same PT-RS port |
| **ZTE** | We prefer Alt.2, which can at least support per TRP PTRS-DMRS association indication and without DCI overhead increasing. |
| **Vivo** | Support Alt2. Although it is not perfect, it is better than Alt.1. Alt 2 gives more flexibility for both TRPs to select one better DMRS port. |
| **Samsung** | Alt 2 is more preferred but we can live with alt 1. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Support Alt.1. We share similar view with QC. |
| **Xiaomi** | Our first preference is option.1 (4bits). But we can agree with Alt.1 as the feature lead proposed as a compromise. |
| **Nokia** | Support Alt.1. It is not wise to go back to older proposals. |
| **OPPO** | Support Alt.1 since overdesign is not preferred |
| **Fl Update #3** | This proposal is not going anywhere as the group is not converging. Fl suggestion is Alt.1. Not agreeing to this seems also means the legacy behavior.  **Proposed conclusion 3.4:** For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH Type B repetition, the indication of PTRS-DMRS association for maxRank > 2 is based on the legacy framework, i.e., the same PTRS-DMRS association field is applied to both TRPs (to both sets of repetitions). |
| **ZTE** | We cannot live with this proposal, it is unfair to preclude this enhancement for the case of rank > 2. Does it mean any restriction on higher rank? We fail to see any agreement/conclusion in RAN1 so far. |
| **Ericson** | NR Rel-15/16 does not support two TRPs for PUSCH. So, we do not agree that the ‘proposed conclusion 3.4’ in FL update #3 is legacy behavior (since two TRPs is not supported in legacy). In our view, Alt1 is another enhancement which was not part of the previous agreement from two meetings ago.  We support Alt 2 in FL Update #1. We think it may be better to treat this GTW online. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Support |
| **vivo** | Don’t support proposed conclusion 3.4 in Fl Update #3. Still support Alt 2 in FL Update #1. We prefer a unified design on PTRS-DMRS association field. Per-TRP PTRS-DMRS association indication is adopted for maxRank=2. Similar scheme (Alt 2) can be used for maxRank >2. |
| **Fl Update #4** | This for GTW if we get time after critical issue. I have other proposals in mind as priority issues.  Based on E/// comment, I feel that Alt.1 should be clarified to make sure that there is no misunderstanding. Legacy framework is applied by default for PUSCH repetitions, having single beam or two beams used in the repetitions does not change that in this specific scenario.  **Proposal 3.4:** Select one of the following,  **Alt.1:** For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH Type B repetition, the indication of PTRS-DMRS association for maxRank > 2 is not enhanced (~~based~~ use ~~on the~~ legacy framework, i.e., the same PTRS-DMRS association field is applied to both TRPs (to both sets of repetitions)).  *Concerns: please indicate change of views (@ZTE, Apple, E///, LG, vivo, Intel).*  **Alt.2:** For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH Type B repetition, the indication of PTRS-DMRS association for maxRank > 2, 1-bit MSB is used to indicate PTRS-DMRS association for the first TRP, and 1 bit LSB is used to indicate PTRS-DMRS association for the second TRP   * + if *maxNrofPorts* = 1, the 1 bit indicates one of the first two DMRS ports.   + if *maxNrofPorts* = 2, the 1 bit indicates one of two DMRS ports sharing the same PTRS port.   *Concerns: please indicate change of views (@Apple, QC, Xiaomi)* |
| **ZTE** | We have strong concern on the legacy approach when maxRank > 2.  For example, when NCB scheme, if the same PTRS-DMRS association field is applied to both TRPs, that implies the linkage between PTRS and SRS resource(s) is mandatory for the second TRP. For example, when 2-port based NCB MTRP PUSCH repetition, two PTRS ports are used for SRS#0 and SRS#2 in the first SRS set, but SRS#1 and SRS#3 in the second SRS set are corresponded to the 1st and 2nd DMRS ports, the two PTRS ports cannot be used for PUSCH repetitions towards the second TRP.  Hence the approach by Alt. 1 is too restrictive, and we fail to see any technical reason to preclude the enhancement for rank>2. |
| **Fl Update #5** | **Proposal 3.4:** Select one of the following,  **Alt.1:** For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH Type B repetition, the indication of PTRS-DMRS association for maxRank > 2 is not enhanced (~~based~~ use ~~on the~~ legacy framework, i.e., the same PTRS-DMRS association field is applied to both TRPs (to both sets of repetitions)).  *Concerns: please indicate change of views (@ZTE, Apple, E///, LG, vivo, Intel).*  **Alt.2:** For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH Type B repetition, the indication of PTRS-DMRS association for maxRank > 2, 1-bit MSB is used to indicate PTRS-DMRS association for the first TRP, and 1 bit LSB is used to indicate PTRS-DMRS association for the second TRP   * if *maxNrofPorts* = 1, the 1 bit indicates one of the first two DMRS ports. * if *maxNrofPorts* = 2, the 1 bit indicates one of two DMRS ports sharing the same PTRS port.   *Concerns: please indicate change of views (@Apple, QC, Xiaomi)* |
| Futurewei | Support the proposal, and support Alt.2 for it can support TRP-specific operations better. We can live with Alt.1 if the majority supports it. |

Issue #3.6: DCI field on Dynamic Switching

**Question 3.6-2:** On the number of SRS resource configured in the two SRS resource sets, please indicate the preference and the feasibility (with the agreed framework of SRI indication for M-TRP PUSCH repetition) of supporting following alternatives,

* Alt.1: Support the same number of SRS resources for both CB and NCB based m-TRP PUSCH repetition.
* Alt.2: Support different number of SRS resources for both CB and NCB based m-TRP PUSCH repetition. For NCB based PUSCH repetition, first SRS resource set always have the same or larger number of SRS resources than the second SRS resources set.
* Alt.3: Support different number of SRS resources for both CB and NCB based m-TRP PUSCH repetition. For NCB based PUSCH repetition, first SRS resource set always have the smaller, same, or larger number of SRS resources than the second SRS resources set.

Please comment on preferred changes to the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo/MotM | For question 3.6-2, we support Alt.3. |
| TCL | Support the proposal. For question 3.6-2, we support Alt.1. |
| CATT | Support Alt 2. |
| QC | Slight preference for Alt3, but we can be ok with majority view. |
| NEC | Support Alt 2. |
| Apple | We do not think further discussion is needed |
| ZTE | Support Alt. 1.  As we commented before, we fail to see the motivation on configured different number, which is useless and will complicate the specification design for the cases indicated by other codepoints. Once again, it needs to be noted that the following agreement in RAN1 #104-e hints that same SRS resources in two SRS resource sets should be ensured for CB based MTRP PUSCH scheme.   |  | | --- | | ***Agreement***  *For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition schemes, in codebook based PUSCH,*   * *Support two SRI fields corresponding to two SRS resource sets are included in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2.*   + *Each SRI field indicating SRI per TRP, where the SRI field based on Rel-15/16 framework* * *Support dynamic switching between multi-TRP and single-TRP operation* * *FFS: Support dynamic switching the order of two TRPs* | |
| LG | Support Alt 1. |
| MediaTek | Our first preference is Alt. 2 and the second preference is Alt. 3. |
| Vivo | We think for both NCB based and CB based PUSCH repetition, first SRS resource set should have the same or larger number of SRS resources than the second SRS resources set. Different number of UL beams may be applied to the transmission to different TRPs for CB based PUSCH repetition.  Then we support Alt 2 with following updates:   * Alt.2: Support different number of SRS resources for both CB and NCB based m-TRP PUSCH repetition. he first SRS resource set always have the same or larger number of SRS resources than the second SRS resources set. |
| Samsung | Alt 1 is too restrictive so, Alt 2 is enough to support NCB PUSCH. For CB, we don’t need to any restriction because each SRI field is determined separately (as Rel. 15/16). |
| Fujitsu | Slightly prefer Alt 3. |
| NTT Docomo | Prefer alt.3. |
| Xiaomi | Support Alt.1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt 1 is too restrictive to us, which is not needed. |
| CMCC | Support Alt 2 with vivo’s revision. |
| Nokia | We prefer Alt.1 – but we will not object if majority of companies prefer another Option. |
| FL update #3 | **Only Alt.1** – TCL, ZTE, LG, Xiaomi  **Alt.2** – CATT, NEC, Mtek, vivo, SS, HW (?), CMCC  **Only Alt.3** – Lenovo, Fujitsu, DCM, HW (?)  No discussion needed – Apple  Ok with majority – QC, Nokia  To my reading only Alt.1 and Alt.2 are feasible for NCB based PUSCH due to an earlier agreement on how the second SRI field is interpreted based on first SRI field. However, it seems my understanding is different to the companies supported Alt.3.  **@Lenovo, Fujitsu, DCM, Apple >>** Could you please further provide details on the SRI fields are going to interpret when the first SRS resource set have the smaller number of SRS resources than the second SRS resources set.  Please refer to the older agreement we had.  **Agreement**  The following working assumption is confirmed.  For non-codebook based multi-TRP PUSCH, the first SRI field is used to determine the entry of the second SRI field which only contains the SRI(s) combinations corresponding to the indicated rank (number of layers) of the first SRI field. The number of bits, *N2*, for the second SRI field is determined by the maximum number of codepoint(s) per rank among all ranks associated with the first SRI field. For each rank x, the first *Kx* codepoint(s) are mapped to *Kx* SRIs of rank x associated with the first SRS field, the remaining (2N2-*Kx*) codepoint(s) are reserved. |
| Lenovo/MotM | We support only Alt 3.We failed to see the problem when the first SRS resource set has the smaller number of SRS resources than the second SRS resources set, if the SRI field length is determined by the number of SRS resources in the second SRS resource set. |
| Ericsson | We prefer Alt. 1. |
| NTT Docomo | Our interpretation of Alt.3 on the case when the first SRS resource set have the smaller number of SRS resources than the second SRS resources set is as below taking first SRS resource set have 2 SRS resources, second SRS resource set have 4 SRS resources as an example.  **Agreement**  The following working assumption is confirmed.  For non-codebook based multi-TRP PUSCH, the first SRI field is used to determine the entry of the second SRI field which only contains the SRI(s) combinations corresponding to the indicated rank (number of layers) of the first SRI field.  *(We don’t see any issue regarding this agreement. Rank=1 or 2 may be indicated by the 1st SRI field, if rank=1 is indicated by the 1st field, then 2nd SRI field is interpreted with entries only contain rank=1; if rank=2 is indicated by the 1st field, then 2nd SRI field is interpreted with entries only contain rank=2.)*  The number of bits, *N2*, for the second SRI field is determined by the maximum number of codepoint(s) per rank among all ranks associated with the first SRI field. For each rank x, the first *Kx* codepoint(s) are mapped to *Kx* SRIs of rank x associated with the first SRS field, the remaining (2N2-*Kx*) codepoint(s) are reserved.  *(The number of bits of 2nd SRI field is determined by the maximum number of codepoints per rank among all rank associated with the 1st SRI field, in this example the number of bits of 2nd SRI field is determined by maximum number of codepoints among rank=1 and rank=2)*  We don’t see problem of Alt.3. |
| Samsung | For Alt 3, mTRP PUSCH repetition is okay but we want to discuss the bitwidth for sTRP PUSCH repetition by dynamic switching.  First SRS resource set has only one SRS resource but second SRS resource set has four SRS resources as Alt 3. To support mTRP PUSCH repetition, the number of layer should be 1 so the bitwidth of first SRI field is 0 and bitwidth of second SRI field is 2 (total bitwidth of SRI field becomes 2 bits). On the other hand, when the codepoint of dynamic switching field is 01 (that is sTRP transmission with TRP2), how number of layers can be supported? Only 1 layer can be supported or up to 4 layers can be supported? If up to 4 layers can be supported because that is sTRP based repetition, the bitwidth should be 4 bits. But this seems error case because the entire bitwidth of SRI field is changed depending on the other DCI field (dynamic switching field). However, if we support Alt 2 with proper RRC configuration (in this case, first set 🡪 second set and second set 🡪 first set when gNB configure RRC), we can prevent this kind of error cases.  So we think Alt 2 is supportable and we can also live with alt 1 if majority support Alt1. |
| Vivo | Support Alt2.  @ Lenovo/Docomo: the problem of Alt.3 is that the bit width of the first SRI field must be changed according to the interpretation of the codepoint when the first SRS resource set have the smaller number of SRS resources than the second SRS resources set. The reasoning is as follows:  As we have commented, different number of SRS resources of two SRS resource set is useful in practice. Different channel states between the UE and two TRPs, different capability of two UE Tx panels corresponding to two TRPs, and different UL inter-UE interference of two TRPs require different configuration.  We think for both NCB based and CB based PUSCH repetition, first SRS resource set should have the same or larger number of SRS resources than the second SRS resources set. For codepoint ‘01’ the first SRI field is used to indicate SRS resources from the second SRS resource set no matter it is CB based or NCB based PUSCH repetition. If first SRS resource set should have the same or larger number of SRS resources than the second SRS resources set, meaning that bit width of the first SRI field shall be same or larger than the second SRI field, then the first SRI field can indicate any SRI from the second SRS resource set. Otherwise, some SRIs of the second SRS resource set cannot be indicated by the first field with smaller size or the bit width of first SRI field must be changed according to the interpretation of the codepoint of the new field.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Codepoint** | **SRS resource set(s)** | **SRI (for both CB and NCB)/TPMI (CB only) field(s)** | | 00 | s-TRP mode with 1st SRS resource set (TRP1) | 1st SRI/TPMI field (2nd field is unused) | | 01 | s-TRP mode with 2nd SRS resource set (TRP2) | 1st SRI/TPMI field (2nd field is unused) | | 10 | m-TRP mode with (TRP1,TRP2 order)  1st SRI/TPMI field: 1st  SRS resource set  2nd SRI/TPMI field: 2nd SRS resource set | Both 1st and 2nd SRI/TPMI fields | | 11 | m-TRP mode with (TRP2,TRP1 order)  1st SRI/TPMI field: FFS  2nd SRI/TPMI field: FFS | Both 1st and 2nd SRI/TPMI fields |     Then we support Alt 2 with following updates:  Alt.2: Support different number of SRS resources for both CB and NCB based m-TRP PUSCH repetition. he first SRS resource set always have the same or larger number of SRS resources than the second SRS resources set. |
| Fl Update #4 | Thanks to vivo and SS to helping with details. It should be clear to Lenovo and DCM that earlier agreement is not fully inline with Alt.3.  So, let’s use version suggested by vivo.  **Proposal 3.6-2:** On the number of SRS resource configured in the two SRS resource sets,   * Support different number of SRS resources for both CB and NCB based m-TRP PUSCH repetition. The first SRS resource set always have the same or larger number of SRS resources than the second SRS resources set. |
| OPPO | We support Alt.1. We are still not convinced by the use cases proposed by some companies. For a given time, the maximum layers may be different for different TRPs. However, UE usually is moving and the maximum layer supported by the TRPs will be changed. In this, Alt.2/Alt.3 will need RRC reconfiguration to set new sets for the TRP, which will be quite consuming the RRC signaling. In many features (e.g., inter-cell M-TRP), many companies prefer to configure more in order to avoid the frequent RRC re-configuration. Alt.1 is aligned with this principle.  Regarding the discussion Alt.3, we does not agree with SS/vivo and think it is still aligned with the current agreement. gNB can configure 4 SRS resource for TRP, and it has the flexibility to only use two of them for S-TRP and four of them for M-TRP. If gNB really want to use four SRS resource for S-TRP, it can configure them in the first. It is up to gNB implementation. We failed to see the benefits of the restriction proposed by Alt.2. |
| NTT Docomo | @vivo, Samsung, FL  Thanks a lot for discussion. We understand your comments. While in our understanding, bit width of the 1st SRI field can be determined based on maximum number of SRS resources between two resource sets, then the bit width of 1st SRI field is fixed. Which agreement is it not aligned with?  And we have another question for Alt.2, why the restriction is only for NCB. The problem you mentioned seems also exist for CB case if 1st resource set has smaller number than 2nd resource set, because 1st SRI field may correspond to 1st or 2nd resource set depending on dynamic switching field. |
| Lenovo/MotM | We support only Alt 3.We still failed to see the problem when the first SRS resource set has the smaller number of SRS resources than the second SRS resources set, if the first SRI field length is determined by the number of SRS resources in the SRS resource set with more SRS resource number. |
| Ericsson | We have some questions for the proposal in FL’s Update #4  Some possible questions below:  In the previous agreement on switching between 1st and 2nd TRPs for sTRP transmission (i.e., codepoints 00 and 01), the first SRI field is always used. If the number of SRS resources in the 1st and 2nd SRS resource set are different,  1. does it mean the 1st (and 2nd) SRI field size is varying according to the codepoint? Is this acceptable?  2. if the 1st SRS resource set has 4 resources and 2nd SRS resource set has 1 resource. How to interpret “SRI field is present or not present”? it seems that we have to consider each SRS resource set separately, i,.e., 2nd SRS field is not present and the 1st SRS field is present in this case?  3. in the above example, there is only one SRI field for the two SRS resource sets. So SRI present or not need to be linked the indicated SRS resource set, not the SRI field. This could potentially make specification very complicated. |
| Vivo | Thanks for the comments on Alt 2. Please find our reply:  @ OPPO: for scenarios of different number of SRS resources: from the UE antenna side, a UE may be equipped with multiple Tx panels with different capabilities, e.g., different number of SRS ports, different Tx beamforming capabilities, different full power supporting. Different number of SRS resources per set would occur when the UE happens to use two Tx panels for UL MTRP transmission. From the channel aspect, the channels between a UE and two TRPs are probably with different conditions, e.g., LOS or high-correlated channel for TRP1 and NLOS or low-correlated channel for TRP2, or different number of optimal beams identified for two TRPs, leading to different number of preferred ranks per TRP or different number of beams per TRP.  If Alt 1 is supported, the gNB has to always configure same number of SRS resources from two sets to the larger value, it is a waste of DCI size and RRC configuration and UE processing. For example, UE has to transmit some useless SRS to satisfy the extended number, resulting in addition processing complexity and power consumption.  Anyway, Alt.2 doesn’t prevent the gNB to configure same number of SRS resources from two set if it really wants.  @ Docomo @ Lenovo/MotM: since we have agreed the table that the 1st SRI field corresponds to the 2nd SRS resource set for codepoint “01”, and the 1st SRI field corresponds to the 1st SRS resource set for other codepoint, it is strange that the 1st SRI field length sometimes is determined by the 1st SRS resource set sometimes while determined by the 2nd SRS resources set other times.  What’s more, when the 1st SRI field size is determined by the 2nd SRS resource set which has larger number of SRS resources, DCI size will be larger than Alt.3. Take SRS for NCB for example, assuming 2 SRS resources in the 1st SRS resource set and 4 SRS resources in the 2nd SRS resource set, then the 1st SRI field will be 4 bits and the 2nd SRI field will be 3 bits (up to rank2 according to the possible rank for PUSCH repetition), totally 7 bits for both SRI fields will be required for Alt.3; while if Alt.2 is employed, the 1st SRI field will be 4 bits and the 2nd SRI field will be 1 bits (up to rank2), totally 5 bits for both SRI fields will be required.  @Ericsson: for FL’s Update #4 (Alt.2 mentioned above)  1. No, each SRI field size is fixed, and the 1st SRI field is always determined by the 1st SRS resource set which contains larger number of SRS resources.  2. The two SRI field sizes are determined by two SRS resource sets separately, we would interpret your example as two SRI fields with the 2nd SRI field size set to 0.  3. For the interpretation in 2, we see not much complication in specification. |
| CATT | Support FL’s Update #4. |
| Fl Update #5 | Looks like OPPO, DCM and E/// has valid points on the applicability of the Alt.3. After further checking the agreement. The below agreement is **not fully saying that the size of first SRI field is determined only by the first SRS resource set**. As we allow codepoint ‘01’ to be used with second SRS field, the size of first SRI may be based on max of both SRS resource sets (but that is also not supported fully yet).  **Agreement**  The following working assumption is confirmed.  For non-codebook based multi-TRP PUSCH, the first SRI field is used to determine the entry of the second SRI field which only contains the SRI(s) combinations corresponding to the indicated rank (number of layers) of the first SRI field. The number of bits, *N2*, for the second SRI field is determined by the maximum number of codepoint(s) per rank among all ranks associated with the first SRI field. For each rank x, the first *Kx* codepoint(s) are mapped to *Kx* SRIs of rank x associated with the first SRS field, the remaining (2N2-*Kx*) codepoint(s) are reserved.  **Vivo**: Also see my comments towards E/// questions.  **DCM**: “*why the restriction is only for NCB*”, I think there seems to be a misinterpretation of an earlier agreement. The Alt.2 should valid for both CB and NCB.  **E///:**   1. *does it mean the 1st (and 2nd) SRI field size is varying according to the codepoint? Is this acceptable?*   To my reading, one solution is first SRI field size to be determined by the maximum SRS resources among both SRS resource sets. This can still allow not varying size in DCI. The other method is simply agreeing to same number of SRS resources. 2nd field mainly depend on the second SRS resource set.  *2. if the 1st SRS resource set has 4 resources and 2nd SRS resource set has 1 resource. How to interpret “SRI field is present or not present”? it seems that we have to consider each SRS resource set separately, i,.e., 2nd SRS field is not present and the 1st SRS field is present in this case?*  Valid point, if we agree on different sizes for SRS resources for CB based PUSCH, there will not be second SRI field. How to interpret that with existing spec texts may need some clarification. For NCB based PUSCH, 2nd SRI field will be present.   1. *in the above example, there is only one SRI field for the two SRS resource sets. So SRI present or not need to be linked the indicated SRS resource set, not the SRI field. This could potentially make specification very complicated.*   I would agree that having different sizes of SRS resource sets may complicate the specs. However, it is not impossible to support.  **@All**>> I tried to correct the alternatives based on the discussion.  **Proposal 3.6-2:** On the number of SRS resource configured in the two SRS resource sets, select one of the following alternatives,   * Alt.1: Support the same number of SRS resources for both CB and NCB based m-TRP PUSCH repetition. * Alt.2: Support different number of SRS resources for both CB and NCB based m-TRP PUSCH repetition. The first SRS resource set always have the same or larger number of SRS resources than the second SRS resources set.   + The bit width of the 1st SRI field is determined based on maximum number of SRS resources among two resource sets   + FFS: How to interpret “SRI field is present or not present” * Alt.3: Support different number of SRS resources for both CB and NCB based m-TRP PUSCH repetition. The first SRS resource set always have the smaller, same or larger number of SRS resources than the second SRS resources set.   + The bit width of the 1st SRI field is determined based on maximum number of SRS resources among two resource sets   + FFS: How to interpret “SRI field is present or not present”   Based on earlier round of comments, we shall decide one scheme out of these three alternatives. I have slight preference now towards supporting Alt.1 to close this issue ASAP.  **Updated company views.**  **Alt.1** – TCL, ZTE, LG, Xiaomi, E///, OPPO  **Alt.2** – CATT, NEC, Mtek, vivo, SS, HW (?), CMCC  **Alt.3** – Lenovo, Fujitsu, DCM, HW (?)  No discussion needed – Apple  Ok with majority – QC, Nokia |
| Lenovo/MotM | We support Alt.3 where this method is more flexible. |

Closed (Issue #3.7: NCB based PUSCH: number of PT-RS ports)

**Proposal 3.7:** For non-codebook based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition, down-selection one of the two alternatives:

* Alt. 1: the actual number of PT-RS ports corresponding to the 1st and 2nd SRS resource sets are the same.
* Alt. 2: the actual number of PT-RS ports corresponding to the 1st SRS resource set can be different from the actual number of PT-RS ports corresponding to the 2nd SRS resource set.

Please comment on preferred changes to the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **QC** | We think following Rel. 15 procedures can result in Alt2 (since PTRS port depends on SRS resources, which are configured separately). We did not see a strong need for the restriction in Alt1. |
| **LG** | Support Alt 1. Use case for Alt 2 is not clear to us. |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | We prefer to support Alt.2. However, how to determine the TB size should be further clarified if the actual PT-RS ports of different PUSCH repetitions corresponding to different SRS resource sets are be different in Alt. 2. |
| **Apple** | Support Alt1. |
| **Ericsson** | Given the number of PUSCH layers are the same for the two TRPs, supporting the same number of PT-RS ports for the two TRPs may be simpler. So, we have a slight preference for Alt. 1. |
| **Spreadtrum** | We prefer Alt.1. |
| **Samsung** | We have the same view as QC. We think alt. 2 is natural way to support NCB mTRP PUSCH. Each SRI can be determined as each SRS resource set and only restriction is the same number of layers. So, the actual number of PTRS ports for each TRP can be different depending on the selected SRI for each TRP. |
| **Vivo** | We share similar views as QC to support Alt.2.  Alt.1 is unnecessary. |
| Nokia | We share similar view as Ericsson. |
| **CATT** | Support Alt 2. We share similar views as QC, Samsung and vivo. |
| **ZTE** | We prefer Alt. 2. |
| **OPPO** | Support Alt.1 |
| **Fraunhofer IIS/HHI** | Slightly prefer Alt. 1 as it would be the simpler solution |
| **Xiaomi** | Support alt.2 |
| **InterDigital** | Support FL’s proposal. |
| **Intel** | Does alt-2 have specification impact ? |
| **Futurewei** | Slightly prefer Alt 1 |
| **FL update #1** | Alt.1 – LG, Apple, E///, Spreadtrum, Nokia, OPPO, Fraunhofer, FW  Alt.2 – QC, Lenovo, SS, vivo, CATT, ZTE, Xiaomi  @**Lenovo**>> TBS determination does not depend fully on PT-RS REs. The same TB shall be assumed.  @**intel** >> No impact based on FL understanding.  @**All** >> I hope companies can live with Alt.2. Please indicate if there is any spec impact expected on Alt.2. |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | We support both Alt 1 and Alt 2. |
| **TCL** | We support Alt. 1. |
| **Fl update #2** | **Proposed conclusion 3.7:** For non-codebook based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition, select Alt.2.   * Alt. 2: the actual number of PT-RS ports corresponding to the 1st SRS resource set can be different from the actual number of PT-RS ports corresponding to the 2nd SRS resource set.   **@All** >> Please check the latest update on the proposal (which I changed in to a conclusion) and express any concerns (with details). |
| Lenovo/MotM | We are fine to FL’s proposed conclusion. |
| CATT | Support. According to current spec, the calculation of TB size for PUSCH is unrelated to the number of PTRS ports. |
| QC | Support. |
| Apple | If we support mixed case, it could be challenging for PT-RS to DMRS port association indication. We also failed to see the use case. In addition, it seems Alt1 is slightly a majority’s view. |
| ZTE | Support FL’s latest proposal. |
| LG | What is the use case of Alt2? In our view, it seems not practical to use 2 panels for PUSCH transmission toward TRP 1 and 1 panel for PUSCH toward TRP 2. If so, why do we need to support Alt2? |
| MediaTek | Fine with FL’s proposed conclusion. |
| Vivo | Support. |
| Samsung | Support FL’s updated proposal.  Let me explain this with following example of NCB PUSCH.  We assume that SRS resource 0 and 2 in SRS set 1 and set 2 are associated with ptrs port 0 and SRS resource 1 and 3 in SRS set 1 and set 2 are associated ptrs port 1 (it is configured by RRC). In a DCI for scheduling mTRP NCB PUSCH, first SRI indicates SRS resource 0 and 1 (2 layers) and second SRI indicates SRS resource 0 and 2 (2 layers). The number of layers for both TRPs is same. The number of ‘actual’ ptrs ports for the first SRS set is 2 but the number of ‘actual’ ptrs ports for the second SRS set is 1. For other SRI indication case, the number of ‘actual’ ptrs ports for both SRS sets can be same (according to indicated two SRI fields). So, we think alt 2 seems natural way of NCB mTRP PUSCH. Alt 1 seems too restrictive to determine two SRI fields to make the same number of ‘actual’ ptrs ports corresponding both SRS resource sets. |
| Fujitsu | Support the conclusion. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia | Support. Alt.1 may add extra restriction. |
| OPPO | We share the similar view as LG. But we can live with the FL proposal if we can add a note to clearly say that it does not have any spec impact. |
| FL update #3 | Majority supports this. Added a note as suggested by OPPO.  SS answered questions raised by Apple and LG. I assume that clarifies their concerns.  **Proposed conclusion 3.7:** For non-codebook based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition, select Alt.2.   * Alt. 2: the actual number of PT-RS ports corresponding to the 1st SRS resource set can be different from the actual number of PT-RS ports corresponding to the 2nd SRS resource set. * Note: This does not have any spec impact   @**Apple, LG** >> please check above justifications by Samsung. |
| LG | From my understanding, the motivation to support 2 PTRS ports in the legacy system is to track phase noise for two panels, separately. So, if one panel is used for TRP 1 PUSCH transmission and two panels are used for TRP 2 PUSCH transmission, actual number of PTRS port is different for TRP 1 and 2, i.e., one PTRS port for TRP 1 and two ports for TPR2. However, we don’t think this is a practical case. What we think practical is that one panel is used for each TRP or two panels are used for both TRP, which results in the same actual number of PTRS ports. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Fine with the conclusion. |
| ZTE | Fine with this conclusion. |
| NTT Docomo | Support |
| FL update #4 | Discussion is closed as it moved to email. |
| FL update #4 | Proposal agreed over email. Refer section 6 for agreed version. |

Closed (Issue #3.8: CG PUSCH: RV mapping)

**Proposal 3.8:** For RV mapping of type 1 or type 2 CG based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition, support,

* the configured RV sequence (via “*repK-RV*”) is applied separately for PUSCH repetitions corresponding to the first TRP and the second TRP with a an RV offset for the starting RV corresponding to the second TRP (similar to the case of dynamic multi-TRP PUSCH repetition).
* if *startingFromRV0* set to ‘on’, support that the initial transmission can start also from the first transmission occasion and/or any transmission occasions associated with RV=0 for the second TRP, i.e., initial transmission of a transport block may start towards any TRP if the first transmission occasion of the K repetitions is RV = 0 (if configured RV sequence is {0 2 3 1}) or any of the transmission occasions of the K repetitions that are associated with RV = 0 (if the configured RV sequence is {0 3 0 3} or {0,0,0,0}) .
* if *startingFromRV0* set to ‘off’, the initial transmission of a transport block may only start at the first transmission occasion of the K repetitions (same as Rel-15/16).

Please comment on preferred changes to the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **QC** | Support the proposal. |
| **LG** | We propose to more relax potential initial transmission TO in case of 0231. Specifically, it is beneficial to make initial transmission possible in the first RV0 transmission occasion of any TRP. For example, if K=8 and RV sequence 00223311 is used for MTRP PUSCH transmission and *startingFromRV0* set to ‘on’, initial transmission can be done in first or second TO, which provides more flexibility. As another example, if RV sequence 03213012 (0231 for TRP1 and 3102 for TRP2) is applied, initial transmission can be done in first or sixth TO, resulting in latency reduction.  Our revised proposal is shown below:  Proposal 3.8: For RV mapping of type 1 or type 2 CG based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition, support,   * the configured RV sequence (via “*repK-RV*”) is applied separately for PUSCH repetitions corresponding to the first TRP and the second TRP with a an RV offset for the starting RV corresponding to the second TRP (similar to the case of dynamic multi-TRP PUSCH repetition). * if *startingFromRV0* set to ‘on’, support that the initial transmission can start also from the first transmission occasion and/or any transmission occasions associated with RV=0 for the second TRP, i.e., ~~initial transmission of a transport block may start towards any TRP if the first transmission occasion of the K repetitions is RV = 0~~ first transmission occasion of any TRP associated with RV = 0 (if configured RV sequence is {0 2 3 1}) or any of the transmission occasions of the K repetitions that are associated with RV = 0 (if the configured RV sequence is {0 3 0 3} or {0,0,0,0}) . * if *startingFromRV0* set to ‘off’, the initial transmission of a transport block may only start at the first transmission occasion of the K repetitions (same as Rel-15/16). |
| **MediaTek** | Support the proposal. |
| **Apple** | We failed to see the necessity for the RV offset. |
| **Ericsson** | Support the proposal. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Support |
| **NEC** | Support the proposal.  In addition, to reduce the latency, it is beneficial to allow UE to start the initial transmission at the first transmission occasions for both first and second TRP, therefore, we suggest the following additional changes in the proposal.   * if *startingFromRV0* set to ‘off’, the initial transmission of a transport block may ~~only~~ start at the first transmission occasion of any TRP ~~the K repetitions (same as Rel-15/16)~~. |
| **Fujitsu** | Support the proposal. |
| **Vivo** | Similar view as Apple.  For the second bullet, we do not see the spec impact. |
| **CMCC** | Support the proposal. |
| **Nokia** | Support the proposal in principle, considering the suggested updates below.  First, the first part of the second sub-bullet is not fully clear. In addition, the proposal doesn’t seem to cover which PUSCH Tos the UE can use considering the second TRP (assuming a first PUSCH TO with RV0 towards one TRP would be used first). We propose to allow the UE using any PUSCH TO that is associated with the other TRP; otherwise, this will add additional restrictions to which PUSCH Tos can be used as PUSCH transmissions/repetitions, which would at least negatively impact the PUSCH reliability.  Hence, we suggest the following updates:  Proposal 3.8: For RV mapping of type 1 or type 2 CG based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition, support,   * the configured RV sequence (via “*repK-RV*”) is applied separately for PUSCH repetitions corresponding to the first TRP and the second TRP with a an RV offset for the starting RV corresponding to the second TRP (similar to the case of dynamic multi-TRP PUSCH repetition). * if *startingFromRV0* set to ‘on’, support that ~~the initial transmission can start also from the first transmission occasion and/or any transmission occasions associated with RV=0 for the second TRP, i.e.,~~ initial transmission of a transport block may start towards any TRP if the first transmission occasion of the K repetitions is RV = 0 (if configured RV sequence is {0 2 3 1}) or any of the transmission occasions of the K repetitions that are associated with RV = 0 (if the configured RV sequence is {0 3 0 3} or {0,0,0,0}) . All the later PUSCH transmission occasions towards the other TRP can be used as PUSCH transmissions/repetitions. * if *startingFromRV0* set to ‘off’, the initial transmission of a transport block may only start at the first transmission occasion of the K repetitions (same as Rel-15/16). Considering this first transmission occasion is towards one TRP, all the later PUSCH transmission occasions towards the other TRP can be used as PUSCH transmissions/repetitions. |
| **CATT** | Support the proposal in principle. In Rel-16, if *startingFromRV0* set to ‘on’, the initial transmission of a transport block may start at any of the transmission occasions of the K repetitions if the configured RV sequence is {0,0,0,0}, except the last transmission occasion when K≥8. Such restriction also can be included in the proposal. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | We are fine with the proposal. |
| **ZTE** | We prefer FL’s proposal. |
| **OPPO** | Support the proposal. The restriction raised by CATT should also be included. |
| **Fraunhofer IIS/HHI** | Support the proposal |
| **FGI/APT** | We support FL’s proposal. |
| **Xiaomi** | We prefer to allow the gNB to configure separate (same or different) RV sequences for the two TRPs instead of using RV\_offset to provide more flexibility for the scheduling, but we can go with the majority view for this. Thus we can support the FL’s proposal. |
| **Futurewei** | Support the proposal |
| **FL update #1** | **@Apple and vivo:** Offset may allow extra level of control on the used RVs. It may be useful to have when the number of repetitions is small.Also, this is in line with the design method we adopted in other discussions.  **@LG, Nokia >>** May be wording was not perfect in the earlier proposal, but I think the cases you mentioned in your examples are aligned with the intention. Please see the update.  **@NEC >>** *startingFromRV0* set to ‘off’ is only allowing transmission starts with the first transmission occasion. Based on FL understanding, it is good to keep that behavior even for m-TRP as we have the freedom to allowing transmissions in other transmission occasions by setting *startingFromRV0* set to ‘on’.  **@CATT, Oppo** >> yes, the restriction as Rel-15 can be mentioned.  **@All** >> please see the updated proposal.  **Proposal 3.8:** For RV mapping of type 1 or type 2 CG based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition, support,   * the configured RV sequence (via “*repK-RV*”) is applied separately for PUSCH repetitions corresponding to the first TRP and the second TRP [with a an RV offset for the starting RV corresponding to the second TRP (similar to the case of dynamic multi-TRP PUSCH repetition).] % concerns to remove bracket: Apple, vivo * if *startingFromRV0* set to ‘on’, support that the ~~initial transmission can start also from the first transmission occasion and/or any transmission occasions associated with RV=0 for the second TRP,~~ ~~i.e.,~~ initial transmission of a transport block may start towards any TRP if the first transmission occasion of the K repetitions is RV = 0 (if configured RV sequence is {0 2 3 1}) or any of the transmission occasions of the K repetitions that are associated with RV = 0 (if the configured RV sequence is {0 3 0 3} or {0,0,0,0}. For {0,0,0,0}, ‘any of the transmission’ does not include the last transmission occasion when K≥8). * if *startingFromRV0* set to ‘off’, the initial transmission of a transport block may only start at the first transmission occasion of the K repetitions (same as Rel-15/16). * Note: After the initial transmission of a transport block towards one TRP, subsequent PUSCH transmission occasions are also transmitted by following the configured RV sequence for K repetitions. |
| **CATT** | **The note is not needed. It seems according to the note, K repetitions are always transmitted. However, whether K repetitions can be transmitted or not depends on the termination conditions specified as in Rel-15.** |
| **QC** | **Ok with the proposal. We are also not sure about the need for the note.** |
| **NEC** | ***startingFromRV0* set to ‘on’**  We prefer to use the original wording ‘initial transmission can start also from the first transmission occasion and/or any transmission occasions associated with RV=0 for the second TRP’ for the second bullet of proposal 3.8.  Based on our reading, the updated wording for second bullet of FL update #1 ‘initial transmission of a transport block may start towards any TRP if the first transmission occasion of the K repetitions is RV = 0 (if configured RV sequence is {0 2 3 1})’ would restrict the initial transmission towards the second TRP if RV offset configured. See LG’s example, if RV sequence 03213012 (0231 for TRP1 and 3102 for TRP2) is applied, the updated wording would not allow initial transmission in the 6th transmission occasion.  ***startingFromRV0* set to ‘off’**  As to the mechanism when *startingFromRV0* set to ‘off’, we still believe it is beneficial to give the first transmission towards the second TRP the same chance for initial transmission as the first transmission towards the first TRP. New parameter *startingFromSecondTRP* can be introduced for gNB to take control. |
| **Apple** | ***OK with the latest proposal.*** |
| **ZTE** | **We can be fine with this proposal without the note .** |
| **LG** | According to current proposal (specifically, with this wording “if the first transmission occasion of the K repetitions is RV = 0”), initial transmission is possible only in the first transmission occasion in case of RV0231. No matter what RV sequence based on 0231, e.g., RV 00223311 or RV 03213012 for K=8, only first TO has a chance for initial transmission. In order to relax possible TO for initial transmission (for the purpose of reducing latency), as we explained in above phase0 input, we suggest to revise the proposal as shown below. Also, we are fine with NEC’s proposal for the case *startingFromRV0* set to ‘off’ and capture it in the revision.  **Proposal 3.8:** For RV mapping of type 1 or type 2 CG based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition, support,   * the configured RV sequence (via “*repK-RV*”) is applied separately for PUSCH repetitions corresponding to the first TRP and the second TRP [with a an RV offset for the starting RV corresponding to the second TRP (similar to the case of dynamic multi-TRP PUSCH repetition).] % concerns to remove bracket: Apple, vivo * if *startingFromRV0* set to ‘on’, support that the ~~initial transmission can start also from the first transmission occasion and/or any transmission occasions associated with RV=0 for the second TRP,~~ ~~i.e.,~~ initial transmission of a transport block may start in the first RV0 transmission occasion of any TRP ~~towards any TRP if the first transmission occasion of the K repetitions is RV = 0~~ (if configured RV sequence is {0 2 3 1}) or any of the transmission occasions of the K repetitions that are associated with RV = 0 (if the configured RV sequence is {0 3 0 3} or {0,0,0,0}. For {0,0,0,0}, ‘any of the transmission’ does not include the last transmission occasion when K≥8). * if *startingFromRV0* set to ‘off’, the initial transmission of a transport block can~~may~~ ~~only~~ start at the first transmission occasion for any TRP among~~of~~ the K repetitions ~~(same as Rel-15/16).~~ * Note: After the initial transmission of a transport block towards one TRP, subsequent PUSCH transmission occasions are also transmitted by following the configured RV sequence for K repetitions. |
| **MediaTek** | Support the proposal in FL Update #1. |
| **Fujitsu** | Support the proposal in FL Update #1. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Support |
| **Xiaomi** | Support the proposal |
| **vivo** | Support the proposal in FL Update #1. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | Fine with the proposal. |
| **CMCC** | Support the proposal in FL Update #1. |
| **Nokia** | Support the updated proposal in principle.  We would be fine to remove the Note or to clarify it (e.g. to say the transmission of *up to* K repetition and that there is no intention to change the existing “termination conditions” (which should be already clear)).  We suggest the following updates for further clarifications (we would also be fine with the intention of LG’s or NEC’s updates):  **Proposal 3.8:** For RV mapping of type 1 or type 2 CG based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition, support,   * the configured RV sequence (via “*repK-RV*”) is applied separately for PUSCH repetitions corresponding to the first TRP and the second TRP [with a an RV offset for the starting RV corresponding to the second TRP (similar to the case of dynamic multi-TRP PUSCH repetition).] % concerns to remove bracket: Apple, vivo * if *startingFromRV0* set to ‘on’, support that the ~~initial transmission can start also from the first transmission occasion and/or any transmission occasions associated with RV=0 for the second TRP,~~ ~~i.e.,~~ initial transmission of a transport block may start towards any TRP using any ~~if the first~~ of the transmission occasions of the K repetitions ~~is~~ that are associated with RV = 0 (if configured RV sequence is {0 2 3 1}) or any of the transmission occasions of the K repetitions that are associated with RV = 0 (if the configured RV sequence is {0 3 0 3} or {0,0,0,0}. For {0,0,0,0}, ‘any of the transmission’ does not include the last transmission occasion when K≥8). * if *startingFromRV0* set to ‘off’, the initial transmission of a transport block may only start at the first transmission occasion of the K repetitions (same as Rel-15/16).   Note: After the initial transmission of a transport block towards one TRP, subsequent PUSCH transmission occasions are also transmitted by following the configured RV sequence for K repetitions. |
| **OPPO** | Support in principle. Regarding the note, we share the similar view as CATT and QC. |
| **FL Update #3** | @Apple, vivo >> thanks for the compromise on the first bullet.  On the note >> Many companies did not like the note. So, the note is removed.  @NEC, LG, Nokia >> with the current wording, I see your point on the restrictions of starting point for TRP2. @NEC >>I do not think we should optimize things further for ***startingFromRV0* set to ‘off’.**  Updated the proposal to correct the issue highlighted by NEC, LG and Nokia.  **Updated Proposal 3.8:** For RV mapping of type 1 or type 2 CG based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition, support,   * the configured RV sequence (via “*repK-RV*”) is applied separately for PUSCH repetitions corresponding to the first TRP and the second TRP with a an RV offset for the starting RV corresponding to the second TRP (similar to the case of dynamic multi-TRP PUSCH repetition). * if *startingFromRV0* set to ‘on’, support that the ~~initial transmission can start also from the first transmission occasion and/or any transmission occasions associated with RV=0 for the second TRP,~~ ~~i.e.,~~ initial transmission of a transport block may start towards any TRP if ~~the first~~ any of the transmission occasions of the K repetitions that are associated with ~~is~~ RV = 0 (if configured RV sequence is {0 2 3 1}) or any of the transmission occasions of the K repetitions that are associated with RV = 0 (if the configured RV sequence is {0 3 0 3} or {0,0,0,0}. For {0,0,0,0}, ‘any of the transmission’ does not include the last transmission occasion when K≥8). * if *startingFromRV0* set to ‘off’, the initial transmission of a transport block may only start at the first transmission occasion of the K repetitions (same as Rel-15/16). * ~~Note: After the initial transmission of a transport block towards one TRP, subsequent PUSCH transmission occasions are also transmitted by following the configured RV sequence for K repetitions.~~ |
| **QC** | Just to confirm our understanding of the above change: If “*repK-RV*”=0231 and RV offset is 0 and number of repetitions are 16 (8 per TRP), does it mean that CG can start from 4 locations (any RV=0 from any TRP) or 2 locations (first RV=0 from any TRP)?  If it can start from 4 locations, then it is not consistent with Rel. 15 sTRP case: (since within a TRP, it can start from 2 locations)  If a configured grant configuration is configured with *startingFromRV0* set to *'off'*, the initial transmission of a transport block may only start at the first transmission occasion of the *K* repetitions. Otherwise, the initial transmission of a transport block may start at  - the first transmission occasion of the *K* repetitions if the configured RV sequence is {0,2,3,1},  - any of the transmission occasions of the *K* repetitions that are associated with RV=0 if the configured RV sequence is {0,3,0,3},  - any of the transmission occasions of the *K* repetitions if the configured RV sequence is {0,0,0,0}, except the last transmission occasion when *K≥8.*  Also, what is the specification impact for “*repK-RV*”=0303 or 0000 given the above? Perhaps the two cases above can be separated (in separate bullets) in the proposal for more clarity |
| **LG** | @QC: repK is up to 8 according to current specification and from my understanding repK is total number of repetition across two TRPs so that maximum repetition number is still 8, not 16. As a result, there is only one location for initial tx for each TRP, i.e., totally 2 locations.  For other RV than 0231, there is no specification impact from my understanding. |
| **QC** | @LG: We do not think max number of repetitions is limited to 8 in current specification.  For PUSCH transmissions with a Type 1 or Type 2 configured grant, the number of (nominal) repetitions *K* to be applied to the transmitted transport block is provided by the indexed row in the time domain resource allocation table if *numberOfRepetitions* is present in the table; otherwise *K* is provided by the higher layer configured parameters *repK.*  numberOfRepetitions-r16 ENUMERATED {n1, n2, n3, n4, n7, n8, n12, n16} |
| **LG** | @QC: Thanks for the explanation. With that understanding, current proposal should be revised. Initial tx should be possible only in the first RV0 transmission occasion of any TRP, instead of any of the transmission occasions associated with is RV = 0. |
| **TCL** | For the third bullet, we share the similar view as NEC and LG. If *startingFromRV0* set to ‘off’, it is beneficial to start the initial transmission of a transport block at the first transmission occasion for any TRP among the K repetitions. |
| **FL Update #4** | @LG, QC >> you have a valid observation. Revised the FL proposal.  Clean version is,  **Updated Proposal 3.8:** For RV mapping of type 1 or type 2 CG based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition, support,   * *Offline agreement : the configured RV sequence (via “repK-RV”) is applied separately for PUSCH repetitions corresponding to the first TRP and the second TRP with a an RV offset for the starting RV corresponding to the second TRP (similar to the case of dynamic multi-TRP PUSCH repetition).* * if *startingFromRV0* set to ‘on’, support that the initial transmission of a transport block may start at:   + the first RV0 transmission occasion of any TRP if the configured RV sequence is {0 2 3 1},   + any of the transmission occasions of the K repetitions that are associated with RV = 0 if the configured RV sequence is {0 3 0 3}, (same as Rel-15/16).   + any of the transmission occasions of the K repetitions if the configured RV sequence is {0,0,0,0}, except the last transmission occasion when K≥8. (same as Rel-15/16). * if *startingFromRV0* set to ‘off’, the initial transmission of a transport block may only start at the first transmission occasion of the K repetitions (same as Rel-15/16).   Also discussion moved to email. |
| **FL Update #5** | Proposal agreed over email. Refer section 6 for agreed version. |

## 3.2 Additional high priority proposals

If companies wish to bring any additional aspects related to PUSCH during RAN1 #106-e, please comment below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support up to 2 default beams and up to 2 default pathloss reference RSs determination in S-DCI based M-TRP to support M-TRP PUCCH/PUSCH transmission. |
| FL update #1 | **@All** >> Please further indicate if you have similar understanding with Lenovo. |

# Agreements from Phase 0

**Agreement**

When DCI schedules a retransmission of CG-PUSCH for type 1 CG or type 2 CG (DCI with CRC scrambled with CS-RNTI and NDI=1) while the CG configuration is RRC-configured with two fields of power control parameters, apply the same procedure as DCI activation for CG type 2 agreed before, i.e.,

* The first (legacy) RRC-configured fields ‘*p0-PUSCH-Alpha*’ and ‘*powerControlLoopToUse*’ are associated with the first SRS resource set.
* The second (new) RRC-configured fields ‘*p0-PUSCH-Alpha*’ and ‘*powerControlLoopToUse*’ are associated with the second SRS resource set.
* Applying the first, second, or both first and second RRC-configured fields ‘*p0-PUSCH-Alpha*’ and ‘*powerControlLoopToUse*’ is determined from the new DCI field (for dynamic switching) of the activating DCI similar to the case of DG-PUSCH.

**Agreement**

When fallback DCI (DCI format 0\_0) activates a type 2 CG or schedules a retransmission of a type 1 or type 2 CG, and the CG configuration is RRC-configured with 2 sets of power control parameters (two ‘*p0-PUSCH-Alpha*’ and ‘*powerControlLoopToUse*’):

* The UE uses the first set of values for power control (first RRC-configured ‘*p0-PUSCH-Alpha*’ and ‘*powerControlLoopToUse*’).

**Agreement**

When a DCI that includes the new 2-bits DCI field for dynamic switching activates a type 2 CG or schedules a retransmission of a type 1 or type 2 CG, and the CG configuration is RRC-configured with only one set of power control parameters (one ‘*p0-PUSCH-Alpha*’ and ‘*powerControlLoopToUse*’):

* The UE expects the new DCI field for dynamic switching is set to “00”, and all PUSCH repetitions are associated with the first SRS resource set.

**Agreement**

For the new field in DCI for dynamic switching,

* For Codepoint “11”, the 1st SRI/TPMI field associate with the 1st SRS resource set while the 2nd SRI/TPMI field associate with the 2nd SRS resource set. i.e.,

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Codepoint** | **SRS resource set(s)** | **SRI (for both CB and NCB)/TPMI (CB only) field(s)** |
| 11 | m-TRP mode with (TRP2,TRP1 order)  1st SRI/TPMI field: 1st  SRS resource set  2nd SRI/TPMI field: 2nd SRS resource set | Both 1st and 2nd SRI/TPMI fields |

* For Codepoint “11”, the first repetition in time is associated with the second SRS resource set, and the remaining repetitions follow the configured mapping pattern (cyclic or sequential).
* For Codepoint “10”, the first repetition in time is associated with the first SRS resource set, and the remaining repetitions follow the configured mapping pattern (cyclic or sequential).

**Agreement**

For PHR reporting related to M-TRP PUSCH repetition, support Option 4 as UE optional capability for a UE that supports mTRP PUSCH,

* Option 4: Calculate two PHRs (at least corresponding to the CC that applies m-TRP PUSCH repetitions), each associated with a first PUSCH occasion to each TRP, and report two PHRs.

**Agreement**

For SP-CSI report on mTRP PUSCH repetition Type A and B activated by a DCI, support the use of a similar mechanism to A-CSI multiplexing on M-TRP PUSCH without a TB, which includes the following,

* When SP-CSI multiplexed on m-TRP PUSCH, SP-CSI multiplexed on the two repetitions associated with the two TRPs, and the number of repetitions is always assumed to be 2, regardless of the value indicated.
* For mTRP PUSCH repetition Type A, or for the first PUSCH after activation for PUSCH repetition Type B**,** reuse similar conditions to support SP-CSI multiplexing on m-TRP PUSCH as defined in A-CSI multiplexing on M-TRP PUSCH, i.e.,
  + The UE is expected to follow the above operation for transmitting SP-CSI on two PUSCH repetitions only if
    - For the first PUSCH after activation for PUSCH repetition Type B, the first and second nominal repetitions are expected to be the same as the first and second actual repetitions, respectively (no segmentation).
    - For PUSCH repetition Type A and B, UCIs other than the SP-CSI are not multiplexed on any of the two PUSCH repetitions.
  + When the UE does not follow the above operation, UE transmits SP-CSI only on the first PUSCH repetition similar to Rel. 15/16.
* For subsequent PUSCHs after activation (without corresponding PDCCH) for PUSCH repetition Type B, use the following criteria,
  + If the first / second nominal repetition is not the same as the first / second actual repetition, the first / second nominal repetition is dropped
    - If one of the first or second nominal repetitions is not dropped, SP-CSI is multiplexed on that repetition
  + Else (the first and second nominal repetitions are the same as the first and second actual repetitions)
    - If UCIs other than the SP-CSI are not multiplexed on any of the two PUSCH repetitions, SP-CSI is multiplexed on both repetitions.
    - Otherwise, UE transmits SP-CSI only on the first PUSCH repetition similar to Rel. 15/16 (and the second repetition is dropped)

**Agreement**

For indicating per-TRP OLPC set in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2, if no SRI field presents in the DCI,

* Use the existing field (1 or 2 bits) for OLPC set indication and the second p0-PUSCH-SetList-r16.
  + if value of the field equals to ‘0’ or ‘00’, the UE determine two values of P0 for two TRPs (one P0 value for each TRP) from the first and the second default P0 values.
    - Note: per TRP default P0 values to be decided in separate discussion (alt.1, alt.2, alt.3 in default power control parameter sets).
  + if value of the field equals to ‘1’ or ‘01’, the UE determine two values of P0 for two TRPs (one P0 value for each TRP) from the **first value** in the first *P0-PUSCH-Set-r16\_list* and the **first value** in the **second** *P0-PUSCH-Set-r16\_list*.
  + if value of the field equals to ‘10’ or ‘11’, the UE determine two values of P0 for two TRPs (one P0 value for each TRP) from the **second value** in the first *P0-PUSCH-Set-r16\_list* and the **second value** in the **second** *P0-PUSCH-Set-r16\_list.*

**Agreement**

For RV mapping of type 1 or type 2 CG based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition, support,

* the configured RV sequence (via “repK-RV”) is applied separately for PUSCH repetitions corresponding to the first TRP and the second TRP with a an RV offset for the starting RV corresponding to the second TRP (similar to the case of dynamic multi-TRP PUSCH repetition).
* if startingFromRV0 set to ‘on’, support that the initial transmission of a transport block may start at:
  + the first RV0 transmission occasion of any TRP if the configured RV sequence is {0 2 3 1},
  + any of the transmission occasions of the K repetitions that are associated with RV = 0 if the configured RV sequence is {0 3 0 3}, (same as Rel-15/16).
  + any of the transmission occasions of the K repetitions if the configured RV sequence is {0,0,0,0}, except the last transmission occasion when K≥8. (same as Rel-15/16).
* if startingFromRV0 set to ‘off’, the initial transmission of a transport block may only start at the first transmission occasion of the K repetitions (same as Rel-15/16).

**Agreement 2.1-2:**

For per-TRP closed-loop power control, when the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI format 1\_0 (fallback DCI) is associated with two “*closedLoopIndex*” values for multi-TRP PUCCH transmission schemes, the single TPC field (the existing TPC field) is applied to both closed loop indices for the scheduled PUCCH.

**Working assumption 3.7:**

For non-codebook based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition, select Alt.2.

* Alt. 2: the actual number of PT-RS ports corresponding to the 1st SRS resource set can be different from the actual number of PT-RS ports corresponding to the 2nd SRS resource set.
* FFS: Whether specification change is needed due to this working assumption

# Reference

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [R1-2106464](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106464.zip) | Enhancements on multi-TRP for reliability and robustness in Rel-17 | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| [R1-2106542](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106542.zip) | Multi-TRP enhancements for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | ZTE |
| [R1-2106572](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106572.zip) | Further discussion on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH enhancements | vivo |
| [R1-2106641](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106641.zip) | Discussion on Enhancements for PDCCH, PUCCH, and PUSCH | InterDigital, Inc. |
| [R1-2106667](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106667.zip) | Enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |
| [R1-2106686](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106686.zip) | Discussion on enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | Spreadtrum Communications |
| [R1-2106790](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106790.zip) | Considerations on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH, PUSCH | Sony |
| [R1-2106866](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106866.zip) | Enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | Samsung |
| [R1-2106936](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106936.zip) | Enhancements on multi-TRP/panel transmission for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | CATT |
| [R1-2107030](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107030.zip) | Enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH PUCCH and PUSCH | Fujitsu |
| [R1-2107079](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107079.zip) | Multi-TRP/panel for non-PDSCH | FUTUREWEI |
| [R1-2107144](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107144.zip) | Discussion on multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | NEC |
| [R1-2107204](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107204.zip) | Enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | OPPO |
| [R1-2107293](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107293.zip) | Discussion on enhancements on multi-TRP for uplink channels | FGI, Asia Pacific Telecom |
| [R1-2107324](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107324.zip) | Enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| [R1-2107391](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107391.zip) | Enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | CMCC |
| [R1-2107465](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107465.zip) | On multi-TRP enhancements for PDCCH and PUSCH | Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI |
| [R1-2107486](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107486.zip) | Enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | MediaTek Inc. |
| [R1-2107571](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107571.zip) | Multi-TRP enhancements for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | Intel Corporation |
| [R1-2107719](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107719.zip) | Views on Rel-17 multi-TRP reliability enhancement | Apple |
| [R1-2107815](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107815.zip) | Enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | LG Electronics |
| [R1-2107839](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107839.zip) | Discussion on MTRP for reliability | NTT DOCOMO, INC. |
| [R1-2107894](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107894.zip) | Enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUSCH and PUCCH | Xiaomi |
| [R1-2108020](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2108020.zip) | Enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | Convida Wireless |
| [R1-2108053](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2108053.zip) | Enhancements for Multi-TRP URLLC schemes | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |
| [R1-2108072](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2108072.zip) | Enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | TCL Communication Ltd. |
| [R1-2108074](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2108074.zip) | On PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH enhancements for multi-TRP | Ericsson |
| [R1-2108106](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2108106.zip) | Discussion on mTRP PXXCH | ASUSTeK |

# Previous Agreements

## 5.1 PUCCH

### 102-e (August 2020)

**Agreement**

* Detailed assumptions for PUCCH evaluation:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parameters | Potential values |
| Baseline scheme | Rel-15 PUCCH repetition |
| PUCCH format | Format 1 and 3.  Other PUCCH Formats can be optionally considered. |
| # of RBs/symbols | PUCCH Format 1: 4 symbols, 1 RB  PUCCH Format 3: 4 and 8 symbols, 1 RB  Other combinations are not precluded. |
| UCI payload | 2 bits for PUCCH Format 1 (and Format 0, if considered).  Companies to report assumptions on other PUCCH Formats |
| Frequency hopping | Reported by companies |
| Number of repetitions (when applicable) | 2, 4, 8 |
| Schemes | TDM  Details to be reported by companies |
| Receiver assumption | Reported by companies |

* Detailed assumptions for PUSCH evaluation:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parameters | Potential values |
| Baseline scheme | Rel-15/-16 PUSCH repetition |
| # of RBs/symbols | Companies to Report. |
| DMRS pattern | DM-RS configuration type 1  DM-RS Configuration type 2 (optional) |
| # of layers | 1, 2 (optional) |
| Code rates | Low (<0.2) and moderate (<0.4) |
| Frequency hopping | Reported by companies |
| UL transmission scheme | Codebook based UL transmission is baseline. Non-codebook based can be optional. |
| Redundancy Version | Reported by companies |
| Number of repetitions (when applicable) | 2, 4, 8  Other numbers are not precluded |
| Schemes | TDM  Details to be reported by companies |
| Receiver assumption | Reported by companies |

**Agreement**

To improve reliability and robustness for PUCCH using multi-TRP and/or multi-panel, consider all PUCCH formats.

**Agreement**

To enable TDMed PUCCH transmission with different beams, support configuring/activating of multiple PUCCH Spatial Relation Info. RAN1 shall further study the exact schemes considering the following aspects,

* Method of configuration/activation of multiple spatial relation info
* Use of the same PUCCH resource or different PUCCH resource for PUCCH transmission
* Mapping between PUCCH repetition/symbol and spatial relation info among multiple PUCCH repetitions / multiple PUCCH symbols.

**Agreement**

For configuration/indication of the number of PUCCH repetitions, RAN1 shall further study the following,

* Alt.1: Use Rel-15 like framework
* Alt.2: Dynamic indication of the number of PUCCH repetitions

**Agreement**

For multi-TRP PUCCH transmission, further investigate required power control enhancement.

**Agreement**

Support TDMed PUCCH scheme(s) to improve reliability and robustness for PUCCH using multi-TRP and/or multi-panel. Study the following alternatives,

* Alt.1: supporting both inter-slot repetition and intra-slot repetition / intra-slot beam hopping.
* Alt.2: supporting only inter-slot repetition
* Note1: It is not precluded to study the use of multiple PUCCH resources to repeat the same UCI in both inter-slot repetition and intra-slot repetition.
* Note2: The alternatives are clarified as below,
  + inter-slot repetition: One PUCCH resource carries UCI , another one or more PUCCH resources or the same PUCCH resource in another one or more slots carries a repetition of the UCI .
  + intra-slot repetition: One PUCCH resource carries UCI , another one or more PUCCH resources or the same PUCCH resource in another one or more sub-slots carries a repetition of the UCI
  + intra-slot beam hopping: UCI is transmitted in one PUCCH resource in which different sets of symbols have different beams

### 103-e (November 2020)

**Agreement**

For multi-TRP PUCCH transmission schemes.

* Support multi-TRP inter-slot repetition (Scheme 1)
  + One PUCCH resource carries UCI, another PUCCH resource or the same PUCCH resource in another one or more slots carries a repetition of the UCI.
  + FFS: Number of repetitions
* Further study the support (one or both) of the following schemes
  + Multi-TRP intra-slot beam hopping (Scheme 2)
    - UCI is transmitted in one PUCCH resource in which different sets of symbols within the PUCCH resource have different beams.
    - FFS: More than 2 beam hopping instances per PUCCH resource.
  + Multi-TRP intra-slot repetition (Scheme 3)
    - One PUCCH resource carries UCI, another PUCCH resource or the same PUCCH resource in another one or more sub-slots within a slot carries a repetition of the UCI.
* Note1: whether to support two PUCCH resources or the same PUCCH resource with different beams for Scheme 1 and 3 to be discussed separately.

**Agreement**

For multi-TRP PUCCH transmission schemes,

* For Scheme 1, at least PUCCH format 1/3/4 can be used.
* FFS: Support of PUCCH format 0/2 for Scheme 1
* FFS: Support of PUCCH formats for Scheme 2 and/or Scheme 3 (if schemes are agreed).

**Agreement**

For multi-TRP TDM-ed PUCCH transmission schemes,

* Support the use of a single PUCCH resource
* Up to two spatial relation info’s can be activated per PUCCH resource via MAC CE
* FFS: Required enhancements for FR1
* FFS: Use of multiple PUCCH resources.

**Agreement**

For PUCCH multi-TRP enhancements in FR2,

* Support separate power control parameters for different TRP via associating power control parameters via PUCCH spatial relation info.
  + Note: No spec impact.
* For per TRP closed-loop power control for PUCCH, further study the following alternatives considering TPC command when the “closedLoopIndex” values associated with the two PUCCH spatial relation info’s are not the same.
  + Option.1: A single TPC field is used in DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2, and the TPC value applied for both PUCCH beams
  + Option.2: A single TPC field is used in DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2, and the TPC value applied for one of two PUCCH beams at a slot. The TPC value may be applied for the other PUCCH beam at an another slot.
  + Option 3: A second TPC field is added in DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2.
  + Option 4: A single TPC field is used in DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2, and indicates two TPC values applied to two PUCCH beams, respectively.
* FFS: Transition period for beam / power / frequency change.
* FFS: Required power control enhancements for FR1

**Agreement**

For configuration/indication of the number of PUCCH repetitions for Scheme 1, there is no restriction on using Rel-15 framework on configuring the number of repetitions.

* Rel-17 feMIMO may additionally consider supporting the dynamic indication of the number of repetitions in RAN1 #104 meeting.

**Agreement**

For PUCCH multi-TRP enhancements in FR1,

* Support separate power control for different TRP.
* FFS: how to define the association between PUCCH and TRP.
* FFS: required enhancements.

**Working Assumption**

For PUCCH multi-TRP enhancements in Scheme 1, it is possible to configure either cyclic mapping or sequential mapping of spatial relation info’s over PUCCH repetitions.

* FFS: Applicability of mapping patterns for different beam switching gaps
* The support of cyclic mapping can be optional UE feature for the cases when the number of repetitions is larger than 2.
* Note: For Scheme 1, cyclical mapping pattern and sequential mapping pattern are as follows,
  + Cyclical mapping pattern: the first and second beam are applied to the first and second PUCCH repetition, respectively, and the same beam mapping pattern continues to the remaining PUCCH repetitions.
  + Sequential mapping pattern: the first beam is applied to the first and second PUCCH repetitions, and the second beam is applied to the third and fourth PUCCH repetitions, and the same beam mapping pattern continues to the remaining PUCCH repetitions.

**Agreement**

LS to RAN4 on beam switching gaps for multi-TRP UL transmission is endorsed in R1-2009807.

### 104-e (February 2021)

**Agreement**

For M-TRP PUCCH scheme 1,

* Support PUCCH formats 0 and 2 (in addition to agreed PUCCH formats 1,3,4)

**Agreement**

For M-TRP PUCCH scheme 1,

* For PUCCH formats 1/3/4, values for the total number of repetitions at least contain values 2, 4, and 8.
  + FFS: maximum repetition number can be extended to 16.
* For PUCCH formats 0/2, the total number of repetitions at least contain 2.
  + FFS: other values.
* RRC configured number of slots (repetitions) are applied across both TRPs (e.g if the number of repetitions given by *nrofSlots* in *PUCCH-config* is 8, per TRP limit is 4).

**Agreement**

To support per TRP power control for multi-TRP PUCCH schemes in FR1,

* Two sets of power control parameters are used, and each set has a dedicated value of p0, pathloss RS ID and a closed-loop index.
* FFS: details on how a PUCCH resource can be linked to one or both of the two sets of power control parameters.
* FFS: whether PUCCH resource group can be linked to power control parameter sets.

**Working Assumption**

For PUCCH reliability enhancement, support multi-TRP intra-slot repetition (Scheme 3) for all PUCCH formats.

1. The same PUCCH resource carrying UCI is repeated for X = 2 [consecutive] sub-slots within a slot.
2. Refer the design details related to sub-slot configurations (e.g. other values of X) to Rel-17 eIIoT

Note1: The decision of supporting scheme 3 is only applicable for multi-TRP operation.

**Conclusion**

For Multi-TRP PUCCH Scheme 1/3 at least containing HARQ ACK, supporting dynamic switching between multi-TRP PUCCH scheme and single-TRP PUCCH transmission is not restricted, and can be done by associating,

* a PUCCH resource activated with one or two spatial-relation-info and PRI bit-field indicating a PUCCH resource,
* or a PUCCH resource with one or two power control parameter sets and PRI bit-field indicating a PUCCH resource

FFS: Support of dynamic switching for Scheme 2 (if the schemes supported)

**Conclusion**

Strive to reuse the specification support for dynamic indication of number of repetitions introduced in the Rel-17 coverage enhancement work item for multi-TRP operation. Decide whether further enhancements for multi-TRP operation are necessary in RAN1#106bis. No further discussion on this topic until RAN1#106bis under agenda item 8.1.

**Agreement**

Further study following aspects related to beam mapping and default behaviors for multi-TRP PUCCH/PUSCH schemes,

* Whether enhancements needed on beam mapping in case of PUCCH/PUSCH dropping due to invalid UL symbols
* Whether frequency hopping is performed among the repetitions with the same beam
* Whether defining default beam for PUSCH is needed when PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 when two spatial relation info’s are configured for a PUCCH resource

**Agreement**

Further study following alternatives to support per TRP closed-loop power control for PUCCH , select  from the below options during the RAN1 #104-e-bis meeting.

* Option.1: A single TPC field (the existing TPC field) is used in DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2, and the TPC value applied for both PUCCH beams
* Option.2: A single TPC field (the existing TPC field) is used in DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2, and the TPC value applied for one of two PUCCH beams at a slot. The TPC value may be applied for the other PUCCH beam at an another slot.
* Option 3: A second TPC field (similar to the existing TPC field) is added in DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2.
* Option 4: A single TPC field is used in DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2, and indicates two TPC values applied to two PUCCH beams, respectively.

**Working assumption**

For beam mapping /power control parameter set mapping for PUCCH repetitions,

* For M-TRP PUCCH Scheme 1 in FR1, it is possible to configure either cyclic mapping or sequential mapping of power control parameter sets over PUCCH repetitions (similar to spatial relation info’s over PUCCH repetitions).
* For M-TRP PUCCH Scheme 3, reuse the same methods as Scheme 1 (by replacing slots with sub-slots) for beam mapping or power control resource set mapping to sub-slots.
* This working assumption is also subjected to the RAN4 LS R1-2009807 and confirmed based on the RAN4 reply.

### 104-bis-e (April 2021)

**Agreement**

For the case of multi-TRP, to support per-TRP power control in FR1, the linking of PUCCH resource with [one or] two power control parameter sets, the following is supported

* MAC-CE indicates RRC IE that configures power control parameter sets (p0, pathloss RS ID, and a closed-loop index).
  + The exact design of RRC IE is up to RAN2 but from RAN1 point of view, one possible example is to reuse *PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo* except for the *referenceSignal*

Note: It is common understanding in RAN1 that one PUCCH resource can be linked to one power control parameter set.

**Conclusion**

With reference to the normative work on NR-feMIMO:

Related to the support of switching gap between UL transmissions towards two TRPs in RAN1 specifications, there is no consensus in RAN1 to specify symbol gap(s) for the following cases

* PUSCH Type A
* PUCCH scheme 1
* PUSCH Type B
* PUCCH scheme 3

The above applies for the case included in the LS from RAN4 in R1-2102297.

**Agreement**

When inter-slot frequency hopping is configured with Scheme 1, decide one from the below options in RAN1#105-e meeting,

* Option 1
  + If sequential mapping pattern is configured, frequency hopping is performed on slot level (as in Rel-15).
  + If cyclical mapping pattern is configured, frequency hopping is performed among the repetitions with the same beam.
* Option 2:
  + gNB always configures sequential mapping pattern and frequency hopping is performed on slot level. (no spec impact)
* Option 3:
  + Frequency hopping is performed on slot level as in Rel-15 (no spec impact).

**Agreement**

**Confirm the following Working Assumption**:

For PUCCH multi-TRP enhancements in Scheme 1, it is possible to configure either cyclic mapping or sequential mapping of spatial relation info’s over PUCCH repetitions.

* FFS: Applicability of mapping patterns for different beam switching gaps
* The support of cyclic mapping can be optional UE feature for the cases when the number of repetitions is larger than 2.
* Note: For Scheme 1, cyclical mapping pattern and sequential mapping pattern are as follows,
  + Cyclical mapping pattern: the first and second beam are applied to the first and second PUCCH repetition, respectively, and the same beam mapping pattern continues to the remaining PUCCH repetitions.
  + Sequential mapping pattern: the first beam is applied to the first and second PUCCH repetitions, and the second beam is applied to the third and fourth PUCCH repetitions, and the same beam mapping pattern continues to the remaining PUCCH repetitions.

**Agreement**

**Confirm the following Working Assumption** (with small correction of typo and clarification on UE capability in RED):

* For beam mapping /power control parameter set mapping for PUCCH repetitions,
  + For M-TRP PUCCH Scheme 1 in FR1, it is possible to configure either cyclic mapping or sequential mapping of power control parameter sets over PUCCH repetitions (similar to spatial relation info’s over PUCCH repetitions).
  + For M-TRP PUCCH Scheme 3, reuse the same methods as Scheme 1 (by replacing slots with sub-slots) for beam mapping or power control ~~resource~~ parameter set mapping ~~to sub-slots~~.
  + The support of cyclic mapping can be optional UE feature for the cases when the number of repetitions is larger than 2.

### 105-e (May 2021)

**Agreement**

For multi-TRP PUCCH (scheme 1 and 3) and PUSCH (Type A and B) repetition, when the number of repetitions is equal to two, the first and second transmission occasion shall be associated with two TRPs, respectively (two UL beams or Power control parameter sets), regardless of the configured mapping pattern.

* Note: For M-TRP PUSCH type B, the number of repetitions refers to ‘nominal’ repetition.

**Agreement**

Confirm the working assumption with removing brackets on [consecutive] and adding UE capability.

* For PUCCH reliability enhancement, support multi-TRP intra-slot repetition (Scheme 3) for all PUCCH formats.
  + The same PUCCH resource carrying UCI is repeated for X = 2 ~~[~~consecutive~~]~~ sub-slots within a slot.
  + Refer the design details related to sub-slot configurations (e.g. other values of X) to Rel-17 eIIoT
* Note1: The decision of supporting scheme 3 is only applicable for multi-TRP operation.
* This feature is optional.

**Conclusion**

For multi-TRP PUCCH schemes, only one ‘twoPUCCH-PC-AdjustmentStates’ parameter is configured for both TRPs, and the parameter is shared across both TRPs, which means there will be two closed loops in total (no RAN1 spec impact).

**For future meetings:**

Further study the enhancements needed on grouping of PUCCH resources for Rel-17 multi-TRP PUCCH repetition

**Agreement**

* To support per TRP closed-loop power control for PUCCH with DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2, a second TPC field can be configured via RRC.
* When the second field is configured by RRC, a second TPC field (similar to the existing TPC field) is added in DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2 (option 3).
  + Each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively
    - FFS: Whether or not the mapping between the TPC field and the PUCCH transmissions is needed
* When the second field is not configured by RRC, a single TPC field (the existing TPC field) is used in DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2, and the TPC value applied for the closed loop index(es) for the scheduled PUCCH
* To support per TRP closed-loop power control for PUSCH with DCI formats 0\_1 / 0\_2, adopt the same solution as with M-TRP PUCCH schemes.
  + FFS: any additional considerations
* Support UE to report the capability on whether it supports the second TPC field
* Note1: Per TRP closed-loop power control is only applicable when the “closedLoopIndex” values are not the same for TRPs.

## 5.2 PUSCH

### 102-e (August 2020)

**Agreement**

For M-TRP PUSCH reliability enhancement, support single DCI based PUSCH transmission/repetition scheme(s).

* Further study multi-DCI based PUSCH transmission/repetition scheme(s) to identify potential gains and required enhancements.
* Note: This agreement does not reflect any prioritization of single DCI based PUSCH transmission/repetition over multi-DCI based PUSCH transmission/repetition. Ran1 can further discuss that in the next meeting.

**Agreement**

For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH reliability enhancement, support TDMed PUSCH repetition scheme(s) based on Rel-16 PUSCH repetition Type A and Type B.

* Further study PUSCH transmission without repetition as a potential candidate M-TRP PUSCH scheme

**Agreement**

To support single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition scheme(s), up to two beams are supported. RAN1 shall further study the details considering,

1. Codebook based and non-codebook based PUSCH
2. Enhancements on SRI/TPMI/power control parameters/any other

Note1: Companies are encouraged to provide additional details on how above enhancements are applied to different PUSCH repetitions (e.g. mapping between PUSCH repetitions and beams)

Note2: Studying enhancements/aspects related to TA is not precluded.

**Agreement**

Further study M-TRP CG PUSCH reliability enhancements in Rel-17.

**Agreement**

On the mapping between PUSCH repetitions and beams in single DCI based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition Type A and Type B, further study the following,

* For both PUSCH repetition Type A and B, how the beams are mapped to different PUSCH repetitions (or slots/frequency hops),
  + Alt.1: cyclical mapping pattern (the first and second beam are applied to the first and second PUSCH repetition, respectively, and the same beam mapping pattern continues to the remaining PUSCH repetitions).
  + Alt.2: sequential mapping pattern (the first beam is applied to the first and second PUSCH repetitions, and the second beam is applied to the third and fourth PUSCH repetitions, and the same beam mapping pattern continues to the remaining PUSCH repetitions).
  + Alt.3: Half-Half pattern (the first beam is applied to the first half of PUSCH repetitions, and the second beam is applied to the second half of PUSCH repetitions)
  + Alt.~~3~~4: Other variants (e.g. configurable mapping patterns)
  + Note1: For PUSCH repetition type B, the variants considering slot level beam mapping with the same mapping principals (replacing repetition with slot) in Alt.1/2/3 are also included.
  + Note2: For PUSCH repetition type A and B with frequency hopping, the variants considering frequency hop level beam mapping with the same mapping principals (replacing repetition with frequency hop) in Alt.1/2/3 can also be studied further. Final selection of such schemes also depends on the number of beams allowed per PUSCH repetition.
* For PUSCH repetition Type B, which repetition type that the beams shall consider for the mapping,
  + Alt.1: beams are mapped to the nominal repetitions
  + Alt.2: beams are mapped to the actual repetitions
  + Alt.3: beams are mapped to different slots (not in the granularity of actual/nominal repetition)
  + Alt.4: Other variants
* Consider additional requirements on switching gap(s) between two PUSCH repetitions towards different TRPs considering beam switching latency aspects.
* Note: use of the above solutions to multi-DCI based PUSCH repetition and TDMed PUSCH transmission without repetition (when there are agreed to support) is not precluded.

### 103-e (November 2020)

**Agreement**

For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition schemes, support codebook based PUSCH transmission with following enhancements.

* Support the indication of two SRIs.
  + Alt1: Bit field of SRI shall be enhanced.
  + Alt2: No changes on SRI field
* Support the indication of two TPMIs.
  + The same number of layers are applied for both TPMIs if two TPMIs are indicated
  + The number of SRS ports between two TRPs should be same.
  + FFS: Details on indicating two TPMIs (e.g, one TPMI field or two TPMI fields)
* Increase the maximum number of SRS resource sets to two
* FFS: configuration details of each SRS resource set (e.g., number of SRS resources in a resource set)

**Agreement**

For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition schemes, support non-codebook based PUSCH transmission with following considerations.

* Increase the maximum number of SRS resource sets to two, and associated CSI-RS resource can be configured per SRS resource set.
* FFS: Enhancements on SRI field in DCI to indicate the two beams for repetitions

**Agreement**

For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition Type B, at least nominal repetitions are used to map beams

* Further study details and applicability of each mapping method
* Further study the slot based beam mapping in the cases of nominal repetition across slot boundaries

**Agreement**

For PUSCH multi-TRP enhancements,

* For per TRP closed-loop power control for PUSCH, further study the following alternatives when the “closedLoopIndex” values are different.
  + Option.1: A single TPC field is used in DCI formats 0\_1 / 0\_2, and the TPC value applied for both PUSCH beams
  + Option.2: A single TPC field is used in DCI formats 0\_1 / 0\_2, and the TPC value applied for one of two PUSCH beams at a slot.
  + Option 3: A second TPC field is added in DCI formats 0\_1 / 0\_2.
  + Option 4: A single TPC field is used in DCI formats 0\_1 / 0\_2, and indicates two TPC values applied to two PUSCH beams, respectively.
* FFS: Transition period for beam / power / frequency change.

**Agreement**

Support both type 1 and type 2 CG PUSCH transmission towards MTRP. Further study the following alternatives,

* Alt.1 : single CG configuration
  + Repetitions of a TB transmitted towards MTPR on multiple PUSCH transmission occasions of single CG configuration.
  + At least for codebook-based CG PUSCH, support configuring 2 SRIs/TPMIs.
* Alt.2 : multiple CG configurations
  + Repetitions of a TB transmitted towards MTRP on more than one PUSCH transmission occasions, where one or more transmission occasions are from one CG configuration and another one or more PUSCH transmission occasions are from another CG configuration.
  + 1 SRI/TPMI is configured/indicated for each CG configuration.
* Further study required beam mapping principals, low overhead mechanisms for beam selection, and other enhancements for Alt.1 and Alt.2.

**Agreement**

For M-TRP PUSCH reliability enhancement, further discuss multi-DCI based PUSCH transmission/repetition scheme(s) considering the following aspects.

* The same TB is repeated towards multiple TRPs with different beams, where one or more PUSCH repetitions are scheduled by one DCI and another one or more PUSCH repetitions are scheduled by another DCI.
* FFS: Details related to timeline restrictions and beam mapping
* Changes on Rel-15/16 MCS, TBS determination, and UL resource allocation are not expected from this scheme.
* The scheme is considered to be supported only if there are gains over single DCI based PUSCH repetition schemes and a similar scheme is not supported by m-TRP PDCCH (e.g. Option 3).

Companies are encouraged to provide simulation results to decide the support of the scheme in next RAN1 meetings

The support of multi-DCI based PUSCH transmission/repetition scheme(s) in Rel-17 will be decided in RAN1#104-e

**Agreement**

For single DCI based PUSCH multi-TRP enhancements, support the following RV mapping for PUSCH repetition Type A,

* DCI indicates the first RV for the first PUSCH repetition, and the RV pattern (0 2 3 1) is applied separately to PUSCH repetitions of different TRPs with a possibility of configuring RV offset for the starting RV for the second TRP (The same method as PDSCH scheme 4)
* FFS: Reuse of the same method for PUSCH repetition Type B.

**Agreement**

For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition Type A and B, further study required enhancements on PTRS-DMRS association.

**Working Assumption**

For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition Type A and B, it is possible to configure either cyclic mapping or sequential mapping of UL beams.

* The support of cyclic mapping can be optional UE feature for the cases when the number of repetitions is larger than 2.
* FFS: Support of half-half mapping.
* FFS: Additional considerations on mapping patterns (including required beam switching gaps)
* Companies are encouraged to provide further simulation results to decide details.

**Agreement**

LS to RAN4 on beam switching gaps for multi-TRP UL transmission is endorsed in R1-2009807.

### 104-e (February 2021)

**Agreement**

For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition Type B, support the following RV mapping,

* DCI indicates the first RV for the first PUSCH actual repetition, and the RV pattern (0 2 3 1) is applied separately to PUSCH actual repetitions of different TRPs with a possibility of configuring RV offset for the starting RV for the first actual repetition towards second TRP (The same method as PDSCH scheme 4).

**Agreement**

Support CG PUSCH transmission towards M-TRPs using a single CG configuration.

* Use same beam mapping principals as dynamic grant PUSCH repetition scheme.
* FFS: Required changes on CG parameters (ConfiguredGrantConfig)
* The feature is UE optional

**Agreement**

For single-DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition schemes, up to two power control parameter sets (using *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl*) can be applied when SRS resources from two SRS resource sets indicated in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2.

* FFS1: Details on linking SRI fields to two power control parameters,
  + Alt. 1: Add second *sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList*, and select two *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl* from two *sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList*
  + Alt. 2: Add SRS resource set ID in *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl*, and select *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl* from *sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList* considering the SRS resource set ID
  + Alt. 3: Let RAN2 handle this
  + Alt.4: Add second *sri-PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id*/*sri-P0-PUSCH-AlphaSetId*/*sri-PUSCH-ClosedLoopIndex* in *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl*.
* FFS2: Enhancements on open-loop power control parameter set indication
* FFS3: Consideration on *srs-PowerControlAdjustmentStates*
* FFS4: Impact of multi-TRP PUSCH repetition on PHR reporting
* FFS5: Enhancement on power control parameters per TRP when SRI(s) indication of two SRS resource sets is absent.

**Agreement**

For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition schemes, in codebook based PUSCH,

* Support two SRI fields corresponding to two SRS resource sets are included in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2.
  + Each SRI field indicating SRI per TRP, where the SRI field based on Rel-15/16 framework
* Support dynamic switching between multi-TRP and single-TRP operation
* FFS: Support dynamic switching the order of two TRPs

**Agreement**

For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH Type B repetition schemes,

* For maxRank = 2, the number of bits for the indication of PTRS-DMRS association is the same as Rel-15/16, MSB and LSB separately indicating the association between PTRS port and DMRS port for two TRPs.
* FFS: the indication of PTRS-DMRS association for maxRank > 2.

**Agreement**

For s-DCI based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition Type A and B, if the DCI schedules A-CSI, support multiplexing A-CSI on the first PUSCH repetition corresponding to the first beam and the X-th PUSCH repetition corresponding to the second beam.

* For PUSCH repetition Type A, X=1 (the first PUSCH repetition corresponding to the second beam)
* For PUSCH repetition Type B, the first actual PUSCH repetition corresponding to the first beam and the X-th actual repetition corresponding to the second beam are considered,
  + The UE does not expect the first actual repetition corresponding to the first beam and the X-th actual repetition corresponding to the second beam to have a single symbol duration (similar restriction as in Rel-16 NR for the single TRP case).
  + The first actual repetition corresponding to the first beam and the X-th actual repetition corresponding to the second beam are expected to have the same number of symbols
  + FFS: X = 1 or X = the first actual repetition corresponding to the second beam that contains the same number of symbols as the first actual repetition with the first beam
* FFS: Any further restrictions/enhancements needed on supporting A-CSI multiplexing on PUSCH repetitions
* FFS: whether to support multiplexing SP-CSI/P-CSI on PUSCH repetitions towards multiple TRPs.

**Agreement**

Further study following aspects related to beam mapping and default behaviors for multi-TRP PUCCH/PUSCH schemes,

* Whether enhancements needed on beam mapping in case of PUCCH/PUSCH dropping due to invalid UL symbols
* Whether frequency hopping is performed among the repetitions with the same beam
* Whether defining default beam for PUSCH is needed when PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 when two spatial relation info’s are configured for a PUCCH resource

**Agreement**

For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition schemes, in codebook based PUSCH,

* Two TPMI fields are indicated in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2.
  + The first TPMI field uses the Rel-15/16 TPMI field design (which includes TPMI index and the number of layers) of DCI format 0\_1/0\_2. The second TPMI field only contains~~indicates~~ the second TPMI index. The same number of layers are applied as indicated in the first TPMI field.
  + FFS: Details of second TPMI field interpretation including changes expected in Tables 7.3.1.1.2-2/2A/2B/3/3A/4/4A/5/5A in 38.212
  + FFS: Interpreting TPMI fields when multi-TRP and single-TRP PUSCH repetition is applied.
* FFS: whether to support of PUSCH repetitions transmitting towards two TRPs sharing the same TPMI indicated by a TPMI field.
* FFS: The size of the second TPMI field can be equal to or smaller than the size of the first TPMI field

**Agreement**

For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition schemes, in non-codebook based PUSCH,

* Support two SRI field(s) corresponding to two SRS resource sets are included in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2.
  + Each SRI field indicating SRI per TRP, where the first SRI field based on Rel-15/16 framework,
  + Support the same number of layers applied over repetitions
  + FFS: details of second SRI field including the specification change for Table 7.3.1.1.2-28/29/30/31 in 38.212.
* Support dynamic switching between multi-TRP and single-TRP operation
  + FFS: whether/how to use SRI field(s) and additional details of SRI field(s) interpretations
* FFS: Minimizing the DCI overhead for PUSCH repetition Type A as a result of number of layers being limited to 1 when more than one repetition is scheduled.
* FFS: Support dynamic switching the order of two TRPs
* Companies are encouraged to provide total payload size of the two SRI fields and scheduling restriction, if any

**Agreement**

Further study following alternatives to support per TRP closed-loop power control for PUSCH , select from the below options during the RAN1 #104-e-bis meeting.

* Option.1: A single TPC field (the existing TPC field) is used in DCI formats 0\_1 / 0\_2, and the TPC value applied for both PUSCH beams
* Option.2: A single TPC field (the existing TPC field) is used in DCI formats 0\_1 / 0\_2, and the TPC value applied for one of two PUSCH beams at a slot.
* Option 3: A second TPC field (similar to the existing TPC field) is added in DCI formats 0\_1 / 0\_2.
* Option 4: A single TPC field is used in DCI formats 0\_1 / 0\_2, and indicates two TPC values applied to two PUSCH beams, respectively.

### 104-bis-e (April 2021)

**Agreement**

When SRS resources from two SRS resource sets indicated in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2, for linking SRI fields to two power control parameters, it is up to RAN2 to finalize the RRC details related to linking. RAN1 identified that the following options could be used.

* Alt. 1: Add second *sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList*, and select two *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl* from two *sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList*
* Alt. 2: Add SRS resource set ID in *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl*, and select *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl* from *sri-PUSCH-MappingToAddModList* considering the SRS resource set ID

**Agreement**

For PHR reporting related to M-TRP PUSCH repetition, select one from the following options in RAN1 #105-e meeting.

* Option 1:  Calculate one PHR associated with the first PUSCH occasion (earliest repetition that overlaps with the first slot in which the PUSCH that carries the PHR MAC-CE is transmitted)
* Option 2: Calculate two PHRs, each associated with a first PUSCH occasion to each TRP, but report one of them
  + FFS: How to select the PHR for reporting.
* Option 4: Calculate two PHRs, each associated with a first PUSCH occasion to each TRP, and report two PHRs
* Option 5: No changes to legacy PHR reporting

**Agreement**

When MAC-CE indicates a PL-RS ID for one or more SRI IDs, it also indicates whether the SRI IDs are associated with the first or the second SRS resource set.

**Agreement**

For multiplexing A-CSI on two PUSCH repetitions in the case of multi-TRP PUSCH repetition,

* For S-DCI based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition Type B, support multiplexing A-CSI on the first PUSCH repetition corresponding to the first beam and the first (X = 1) PUSCH repetition corresponding to the second beam.
  + The UE is expected to follow the above operation for multiplexing A-CSI on two PUSCH repetitions only if
    - the first actual repetition corresponding to the first beam and the first actual repetition corresponding to the second beam have the same number of symbols, and
    - UCIs other than the A-CSI are not multiplexed on any of the two PUSCH repetitions.
  + When the UE does not follow the above operation, UE multiplexes A-CSI only on the first PUSCH repetition similar to Rel. 15/16.
* The content for the two A-CSI should be the same
* Note: RAN1 has the assumption on CSI timelines are followed as rel-15/16, including UE shall expect the timeline for the first A-CSI meets Z and Z’ requirement
* FFS: For s-DCI based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition Type A and B, support multiplexing of A-CSI on the first PUSCH repetition corresponding to the first beam and the first PUSCH repetition corresponding to the second beam when there is no TB carried in the PUSCH.
  + The UE assumes that the number of repetitions is 2 regardless of the indicated number of repetitions.
  + For PUSCH repetition Type B, the first and second nominal repetitions are expected to be the same as the first and second actual repetitions, respectively (no segmentation).

**Working Assumption**

For indicating STRP/MTRP dynamic switching for non-CB/CB based MTRP PUSCH repetition,

* Introduce a new field in DCI to indicate at least the S-TRP or M-TRP operation
  + FFS: Whether the new field is 1 bit or 2 bits

**Working Assumption**

For non-codebook based multi-TRP PUSCH, the first SRI field is used to determine the entry of the second SRI field which only contains the SRI(s) combinations corresponding to the indicated rank (number of layers) of the first SRI field. The number of bits, *N2*, for the second SRI field is determined by the maximum number of codepoint(s) per rank among all ranks associated with the first SRI field. For each rank x, the first *Kx* codepoint(s) are mapped to *Kx* SRIs of rank x associated with the first SRS field, the remaining (2N2-*Kx*) codepoint(s) are reserved.



**Agreement**

For the indication of open-loop power control parameter (OLPC) in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2, support enhanced open-loop power control parameter (OLPC) set indication by indicating per-TRP OLPC set.

* FFS: Details of indication.

**Agreement**

For CB based M-TRP PUSCH repetition, the first TPMI field is used to determine the entry of the second TPMI field which only contains TPMIs corresponding to the indicated rank (number of layers) of the first TPMI field. The second TPMI field’s bit width, *M2*, is determined by the maximum number of TPMIs per rank among all ranks associated with the first TPMI field. For each rank y, the first *Ky* codepoint(s) of the second TPMI field are mapped to *Ky* TPMI(s) of rank y associated with the first TPMI field in increasing order codepoint index, the remaining (2M2-*Ky*) codepoint(s) are reserved.



* How to describe/capture this in 38.212 is up to the editor.

**Agreement**

**Confirm the following working assumption** (with removing the last bullet):

For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition Type A and B, it is possible to configure either cyclic mapping or sequential mapping of UL beams.

* The support of cyclic mapping can be optional UE feature for the cases when the number of repetitions is larger than 2.
* FFS: Support of half-half mapping.
* FFS: Additional considerations on mapping patterns (including required beam switching gaps)

**Agreement**

For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH Type B repetition, the indication of PTRS-DMRS association for maxRank > 2 is supported, down select one of the following options in RAN1 #105-e meeting,

* The support of cyclic mapping can be optional UE feature for the cases when the number of repetitions is larger than 2.
* Option 1 (4 bits): with a second PTRS-DMRS association field (similar to the existing field), and each field separately indicating the association between PTRS port and DMRS port for two TRPs.
* Option 2 (2 bits): using the existing PTRS-DMRS association field in DCI for the first TRP, and using reserved entries/bits in DM-RS port indication field for the second TRP.
* Option 3 (2 bits): 1 bit MSB is used to indicate PTRS-DMRS association for the first TRP, and 1 bit LSB is used to indicate PTRS-DMRS association for the second TRP
  + if *maxNrofPorts* = 1, the 1 bit indicates one of the first two DMRS ports.
  + if *maxNrofPorts* = 2, the 1 bit indicates one of two DMRS ports sharing the same PTRS port.

**Agreement**

For type 1 or type 2 CG based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition,

* Introduce the second fields of *'p0-PUSCH-Alpha*' and '*powerControlLoopToUse*' in '*ConfiguredGrantConfig*’
* For type 1 CG based m-TRP PUSCH repetition, introduce the second fields of ‘*pathlossReferenceIndex*’, *'srs-ResourceIndicator*' and '*precodingAndNumberOfLayers*' in *'rrc-ConfiguredUplinkGrant*'.
* For type 2 CG based M-TRP PUSCH, two SRIs/TPMIs are indicated via the activating DCI.
* FFS1: UL PT-RS port(s) and DM-RS port(s) for CG type 1
* FFS3: Details on RV mapping.
* FFS4: Possible transmission occasion for initial transmission
* FFS5: Other TRP specific parameters in '*rrc-ConfiguredUplinkGrant*', e.g., *'dmrs-SeqInitialization*'.

### 105-e (May 2021)

**Agreement**

For indicating per-TRP OLPC set in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2, if two SRI fields present in the DCI,

* Use the existing field (1 bit) for OLPC set indication and a second p0-PUSCH-SetList-r16.
  + if value of the field equals to ‘0’, the UE determine value of P0 from*SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl* with a sri-*PUSCH-PowerControlId* value mapped to the SRI field value corresponding to each TRP.
  + if value of the field equals to ‘1’, the UE determine value of P0 from a first value in P0-PUSCH-Set with a p0-PUSCH-SetId value mapped to the SRI field value corresponding to each TRP.

**Agreement**

For s-DCI based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition Type A and B, support transmitting A-CSI on the first PUSCH repetition corresponding to the first beam and the first PUSCH repetition corresponding to the second beam when there is no TB carried in the PUSCH.

* The UE assumes that the number of repetitions is 2 regardless of the indicated number of repetitions.
* The UE is expected to follow the above operation for transmitting A-CSI on two PUSCH repetitions only if
  + For PUSCH repetition Type B, the first and second nominal repetitions are expected to be the same as the first and second actual repetitions, respectively (no segmentation).
  + For PUSCH repetition Type A and B, UCIs other than the A-CSI are not multiplexed on any of the two PUSCH repetitions.
* When the UE does not follow the above operation, UE transmits A-CSI only on the first PUSCH repetition similar to Rel. 15/16.
* Note: The scheduling offset for the first A-CSI should meet the Z and Z’ requirement

**Agreement**

For s-DCI based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition Type A, the UE is expected to multiplex A-CSI on two PUSCH repetitions only if UCIs other than the A-CSI are not multiplexed on any of the two PUSCH repetitions.

* When the UE does not follow the above operation, UE multiplexes A-CSI only on the first PUSCH repetition similar to Rel. 15/16.

**Agreement**

For multi-TRP PUCCH (scheme 1 and 3) and PUSCH (Type A and B) repetition, when the number of repetitions is equal to two, the first and second transmission occasion shall be associated with two TRPs, respectively (two UL beams or Power control parameter sets), regardless of the configured mapping pattern.

* Note: For M-TRP PUSCH type B, the number of repetitions refers to ‘nominal’ repetition.

**Agreement**

The following working assumption is confirmed.

For non-codebook based multi-TRP PUSCH, the first SRI field is used to determine the entry of the second SRI field which only contains the SRI(s) combinations corresponding to the indicated rank (number of layers) of the first SRI field. The number of bits, *N2*, for the second SRI field is determined by the maximum number of codepoint(s) per rank among all ranks associated with the first SRI field. For each rank x, the first *Kx* codepoint(s) are mapped to *Kx* SRIs of rank x associated with the first SRS field, the remaining (2N2-*Kx*) codepoint(s) are reserved.

**Agreement**

For type 2 CG based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition:

* The first (legacy) RRC-configured fields ‘*p0-PUSCH-Alpha*’ and ‘*powerControlLoopToUse*’ are associated with the first SRS resource set.
* The second (new) RRC-configured fields ‘*p0-PUSCH-Alpha*’ and ‘*powerControlLoopToUse*’ are associated with the second SRS resource set.
* Applying the first, second, or both first and second RRC-configured fields ‘*p0-PUSCH-Alpha*’ and ‘*powerControlLoopToUse*’ is determined from the new DCI field (for dynamic switching) of the activating DCI similar to the case of DG-PUSCH.

**Agreement**

Confirm the Working Assumption (with supporting two bits for the new field).

* For indicating STRP/MTRP dynamic switching for non-CB/CB based MTRP PUSCH repetition,
  + Introduce a new field in DCI to indicate at least the S-TRP or M-TRP operation.
  + The new field is 2 bits

**Agreement**

For the new field in the DCI for dynamic switching, support Alt.1 (modified).

**Alt.1**

* Support 2 bits with the following combinations.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Codepoint** | **SRS resource set(s)** | **SRI (for both CB and NCB)/TPMI (CB only) field(s)** |
| 00 | s-TRP mode with 1st SRS resource set (TRP1) | 1st SRI/TPMI field (2nd field is unused) |
| 01 | s-TRP mode with 2nd SRS resource set (TRP2) | 1st SRI/TPMI field (2nd field is unused) |
| 10 | m-TRP mode with (TRP1,TRP2 order)  1st SRI/TPMI field: 1st  SRS resource set  2nd SRI/TPMI field: 2nd SRS resource set | Both 1st and 2nd SRI/TPMI fields |
| 11 | m-TRP mode with (TRP2,TRP1 order)  1st SRI/TPMI field: FFS  2nd SRI/TPMI field: FFS | Both 1st and 2nd SRI/TPMI fields |

* The SRS resource set with lower ID is the first SRS resource set, and the other SRS resource set is the second SRS resource set.
  + For codebook and non-codebook usage, respectively
* ~~The same number of SRS resource shall be configured in the two SRS resource sets.~~

**Agreement**

For SP-CSI report on mTRP PUSCH repetition Type A and B activated by a DCI, further study the use of a similar mechanism to A-CSI multiplexing on M-TRP PUSCH without a TB, which includes the following,

* When SP-CSI multiplexed on m-TRP PUSCH, SP-CSI multiplexed on the two repetitions associated with the two TRPs, and the number of repetitions is always assumed to be 2, regardless of the value indicated.
* Reuse similar conditions (e.g. UCIs other than the A-CSI are not multiplexed, same number for first actual repetitions, the content of the CSI is the same) to support SP-CSI multiplexing on m-TRP PUSCH as defined in A-CSI multiplexing on M-TRP PUSCH.

**Agreement**

* To support per TRP closed-loop power control for PUCCH with DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2, a second TPC field can be configured via RRC.
* When the second field is configured by RRC, a second TPC field (similar to the existing TPC field) is added in DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2 (option 3).
  + Each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively
    - FFS: Whether or not the mapping between the TPC field and the PUCCH transmissions is needed
* When the second field is not configured by RRC, a single TPC field (the existing TPC field) is used in DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2, and the TPC value applied for the closed loop index(es) for the scheduled PUCCH
* To support per TRP closed-loop power control for PUSCH with DCI formats 0\_1 / 0\_2, adopt the same solution as with M-TRP PUCCH schemes.
  + FFS: any additional considerations
* Support UE to report the capability on whether it supports the second TPC field
* Note1: Per TRP closed-loop power control is only applicable when the “closedLoopIndex” values are not the same for TRPs.

**Agreement**

For single-DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition schemes, when one SRS resource per SRS resource set is configured (i.e., when two SRI fields are absent in DCI formats 0\_1 / 0\_2), default P0, alpha, PL-RS, and closed loop index is defined per TRP. Select one from the following in RAN1 #106-e meeting,

* Alt.1
  + The first P0/alpha, PL-RS, and closed loop index are determined by *sri-PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id*, *sri-P0-PUSCH-AlphaSetId*, and *sri-PUSCH-ClosedLoopIndex* mapped to the first *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* associated with the first SRS resource set.
  + The second P0/alpha, PL-RS, and closed loop index are determined by *sri-PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id*, *sri-P0-PUSCH-AlphaSetId*, and *sri-PUSCH-ClosedLoopIndex* mapped to the first *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* associated with the second SRS resource set.
  + Note: How to design the signaling link *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl with*two SRS resource sets is up to RAN2.
* Alt.2
  + The first set of values {the first value in P0-AlphaSet, the PL-RS corresponded to *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id* = 0 and closed-loop index l = 0} can be used for TRP1, and the second set of values {the second value in P0-AlphaSet, the PL-RS corresponded to *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id* = 1 and closed-loop index l = 1 if  *twoPUSCH-PC-AdjustmentStates* is configured, *l*=0 otherwise } can be used for TRP2.
  + Note: How to design the signaling link sri-PUSCH-PowerControl with two SRS resource sets is up to RAN2.
* Alt.3
  + If the UE is provided*enablePL-RS-UpdateForPUSCH-SRS*, the first set of values {the first value in *P0-AlphaSet*, the PL-RS corresponding to the first *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* associated with the first SRS resource set and closed-loop index *l* = 0} is used for TRP1, and the second set of values {the second value in *P0-AlphaSet*, the PL-RS corresponding to the first *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* associated with the second SRS resource set and closed-loop index *l* = 1 if  *twoPUSCH-PC-AdjustmentStates* is configured, *l*=0 otherwise} is used for TRP2.
  + Otherwise, the first set of values {the first value in *P0-AlphaSet*, the PL-RS with *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id=0* and closed-loop index *l* = 0} can be used for TRP1, and the second set of values {the second value in P0-AlphaSet, the PL-RS with *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id*= 1 and closed-loop index *l* = 1 if  *twoPUSCH-PC-AdjustmentStates* is configured, *l*=0 otherwise } can be used for TRP2.
  + Note: How to design the signaling link sri-PUSCH-PowerControl with two SRS resource sets is up to RAN2.

**For further study in future meetings:**

For PHR reporting related to M-TRP PUSCH repetition, study following aspects related to option 4,

* Option 4: Calculate two PHRs (at least corresponding to the CC that applies m-TRP PUSCH repetitions), each associated with a first PUSCH occasion to each TRP, and report two PHRs.
* FFS1: How the PHRs are calculated for reporting (actual PHR or virtual PHR)
* FFS2: How the PHRs are calculated for reporting for other CCs if the multi-cell PHR MAC CE is applied.
* FFS3: Required changes to triggering conditions including the required higher layer parameters (e.g.,’phr-PeriodicTimer’, ‘phr-ProhibitTimer’, ‘phr-Tx-PowerFactorChange’ as TRP specific).
* FFS4: Report P-MPR and MPE per TRP within the same MAC-CE extension.

Note: Down-selection between Options 1-5 will be based on this study as well as the trade-off between benefit versus UE complexity.